NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

L. MARIA CHILD, Editor. | Without Concealment----Without Compromise. | DAVID LEE CHILD, Assistant Editor.

VOLUME II. | NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 28, 1842. | NUMBER 47.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
At 143, Nassau street, New-York.

☞ All remittances, and letters relating to the pecuniary concerns of the paper, should be addressed to ISAAC T. HOPPER.

☞ Letters relating to the editorial department should be addressed to L. MARIA CHILD.

TERMS.—$2,00 a year, in advance; $2,50 if not paid within six months.

☞ $10,00, in advance, will pay for SIX copies for one year, sent to one address.

☞ TWENTY copies, or more, will be sent to one address, at $1,50 each.

☞ Subscribers can remit money without expense by observing the following rule of the Post Office Department:—"A Postmaster may enclose money in a letter to the publisher of a newspaper, to pay the subscription of a third person, and frank the letter, if written by himself."

H. M. HENRY, PRINTER.

The Standard.

MR. GIDDINGS'S REASONS FOR RESIGNING HIS SEAT IN CONGRESS.

To the people of the 16th Congressional District of Ohio:

FELLOW CITIZENS,—The official relation which has subsisted between us for the last four years, has been suddenly terminated. You are now unrepresented in the Congress of the United States. This being the result of my own act, it becomes my duty to assign to you, and the people of this nation, the reasons and circumstances which induced me to resign back to your hands the high trust you had so generously confided to me. In doing this, I shall ask your attention to the facts immediately connected with those extraordinary proceedings in the House of Representatives, which of late have been the subject of so much comment in that body and in the public press; without reference to matters of general policy which have heretofore been the theme of my annual address on retiring from the sessions of Congress.

You are all aware, that at the time of forming and adopting our Federal Constitution, much difficulty and embarrassment arose from the different views entertained by the northern and southern men upon the subject of the "*slave trade.*" I do not now allude to the question of *slavery*, which, for all present purposes, may be considered a distinct subject, entirely separate from that under consideration.

By the eighth section of the first article of our Federal Constitution, all jurisdiction over the subjects of commerce and navigation upon the high seas, and power to define and punish felonies committed upon the high seas, was expressly granted to the general government. Thus every reader will at once see that the States no longer entertained any jurisdiction upon the common highway of nations: hence the fact that every ship sails under the flag of the United States, and is *national* in its character. It is not known or recognized by other governments or our own laws, as in any respect distinguished by the laws of any particular State.—To the powers thus granted to the federal government, was a limitation contained in the ninth section of the same article, by which Congress were prohibited from interdicting the slave trade, until 1808. Up to this latter period, the citizens of each State were *permitted* to import slaves; yet they did it at their own peril, without any right whatever to call upon the general government or the free States to *protect* or *aid* them in such traffic. They were permitted to go to Africa without authority of law, and to seize or purchase slaves, and import them to the United States. If the persons seized or purchased, defended their liberty against those who attempted to bring them to this country, there was no law of the United States making such defense of their liberty a *crime*. They were held in subjection, not by force of municipal law, but by physical power only. Chains and fetters constituted the safety of those who imported them; on these alone they relied, and no one ever thought of looking to the United States to guard them in what, at that day, MR. Jefferson styled an "execrable commerce." Yet there was a time when the power of chains and fetters was laid aside, and the captor or purchaser looked in part to the power of municipal law to hold such persons in subjection. That event occurred the instant such ship left the high seas and entered the territorial jurisdiction of a slave State. Then the law of such State threw its penalties around them, and punished severely all acts of resistance to those who held them captive. In the year 1807, a law of Congress was passed and approved, by which the importation of such persons was duly declared a crime, and punishable as such, by the laws of the United States. This act took effect on the first of January, 1808. But to this day, no law of Congress has ever been passed, *authorizing* one person to hold another as a slave upon the high seas, or to punish any person for defending his natural right to personal liberty, while sailing upon the high seas, against all attempts to hold him in slavery.

But as persons imported into Virginia, or any other slave State, in 1807, had an undoubted legal right to defend their liberty up to the period of entering the territory of that State, and until the laws of that State could operate upon them: in the same manner, when carried back upon the high seas, where the slave laws of that State cannot reach or punish them, they now possess the legal right to defend their personal liberty. This is manifest, when it is clearly understood that no law can render such an act penal, unless it be a law of Congress; and that no such act has ever been passed. Thus it was evident that the slave dealer who now exports slaves upon the high seas, stands in precisely the same situation as he who imported slaves prior to the year 1808. He does so at his own peril. He must depend upon chains and fetters for his protection, and not upon any law; for no such law exists.

I deem this explanation of the subject necessary to a correct understanding of the principles which guided me in what I deemed a conscientious discharge of the official duties imposed upon me.

Soon after the prohibition of the African slave trade in 1808, a commerce in slaves sprung up between the northern slave States and those lying more south; and of late years it has extended to Texas. This traffic is attended with some degree of risk to the owner, particularly by reason of the difficulty attending the navigation around the peninsula of Florida. Several vessels engaged in this traffic have been wrecked, or driven into British ports by stress of weather, while passing through those difficult channels. When they were thus brought within the jurisdiction of British laws, the slaves refused to submit to their masters, and claimed their right to personal liberty; and such claim has usually been sustained. The owners losing possession of their slaves as early as 1834, called upon the federal government to act on their behalf, for the purpose of obtaining compensation of the British government for their loss. Here was the first departure of our government from what I deem its constitutional powers. The right of the free States to remain exempt from the disgrace or the expense of maintaining the slave trade, I hold to be absolute and undoubted. This right I deem as unquestionable as the right of the slave States to hold slaves. Indeed, they are precisely equal, and in all respects reciprocal. I may have formed erroneous opinions; but I have given much attention to the subject; and after the most careful research, I am fully satisfied, that to involve the free States, to any extent whatever, in the maintenance of the slave trade, is as much a violation of the Federal Constitution, as it would be for Congress to attempt the abolition of slavery in the southern States. For the federal government to apply the national treasure, or to employ the navy of the United States in defending the slave trade, would be a palpable and flagrant infringement of the rights of the North, and the privileges of the free States. Yet the President, being himself an inhabitant of a slave State, and probably anxious to protect an interest in which he had a direct, personal concern, did not hesitate to make the subject a national question. I refer to this transaction as the origin of our present controversy with Great Britain; which, in its inception, was an attempt unconstitutionally to extend the national influence and power over a subject which was held in execration by the free States of the North. Yet it was an executive act, over which the legislature had no control; nor could they interfere, in any manner. The executive had power to open a diplomatic correspondence with Great Britain, and to continue such correspondence. While it remained in the executive archives, and no one understood what doctrine the President had advanced, or what demands he had made, neither legislators or people could discuss the propriety of such correspondence; for the plain and simple reason that they could not understand what it contained. Nor was the President under any obligations to promulgate his views, while in his opinion the interests of the country could in any manner be prejudiced by their discussion. I call your particular attention to this point, as, in the resolutions of censure, I am accused of an improper interference "with the grounds assumed by the high functionary having this matter in charge." I then say that all calls upon the executive for correspondence with other governments, are made *subject to the discretion of the President.*—He communicates or withholds such correspondence, according as he shall judge the public interest to require. If communicated and published, it becomes thereby the legitimate subject of discussion by *every American citizen.* It is the glory of our institutions, that the people are the source of power, and may wield the government for their own benefit. It would ill comport with the intelligence and patriotism of the strongest whig district in the United States, were I to repeat these views for your benefit. I wish you distinctly to understand, fellow-citizens, that I do it solely for the benefit of those who have assailed me for having agitated the matter "*while it was the subject of negotiation between this and the British government.*" I know you will recognize at once the *right of all to discuss and agitate it from the moment of its publication.* I repel, with feelings little short of indignation, the idea that any citizen has not the absolute right and privilege to speak freely of any subject in which the nation is concerned; or that a representative of eighteen thousand free electors of Ohio, and of ninety thousand of the sovereign people, clothed with the sanction of your suffrages, shall bow to the opinion of any man, however *high his functions*, upon a matter in which your wealth, and your honor, and the honor and glory of our nation, are involved.

With a full knowledge of parliamentary usage, and having great experience in legislative proceedings, the Hon. John C. Calhoun, in the Senate of the United States, on the 13th of January, 1840, offered a resolution, calling for a copy of any correspondence which had taken place in regard to slaves who had escaped from on board the several vessels engaged in the coastwise slave trade. On the 14th of the same month, the resolution was agreed to by the Senate, and about ten days thereafter a full communication was made by President Van Buren. By this communication, all matters embraced in that correspondence became the legitimate subject of discussion by the Senate, and by every freeman in the United States, although the negotiation was then, and still is, pending.

In accordance with this view of the subject, on the 4th of March following, Mr. Calhoun offered to the Senate a series of resolutions, establishing the duty of the general government to protect this slave trade. On presenting these resolutions, there was no offer to censure him for interfering with the subject, or for creating division among the people; but they were read, and ordered to be printed. I will not occupy your time with a detail of particulars, but will say that on a subsequent day they were taken up. Mr. Calhoun made an ingenious and able argument in favor of their adoption; and they were fully discussed, so far as the affirmative side of the question was concerned; yet I believe no senator or other person dreamed of any impropriety of this discussion, on account of the subject being in the hands of a "high functionary of government," or because it was a subject of negotiation between the two governments. During the same session, a distinguished member of the House of Representatives, from South Carolina, as chairman of the committee on foreign relations, made a report, in which he alluded to the refusal of Great Britain to render compensation for the slaves who had been liberated from on board American vessels engaged in the slave trade, as a *cause of war.* Yet I am not aware that he was charged with any impropriety for agitating this question while it was a matter of negotiation between our own and the British government.

You are all acquainted with the case of the Creole, an American brig, employed in the slave trade. In October last, she left the port of Richmond, with a cargo of slaves on board. After she had left the territory of Virginia, and after the slave laws of that State ceased to operate upon the persons on board, the slaves rose upon those who held them in subjection, asserted their own liberty, and took the vessel to Nassau, in the island of New Providence, where the laws knew no difference between persons; nor had they any municipal regulations by which the authorities of that island could deliver a slave into the custody of his former master. After this transaction was known, and on the 22d of December last, the Hon. Mr. Barrow, Senator from Louisiana, presented to the Senate of the United States the petition of an insurance company at New Orleans, representing that the petitioners had insured a number of slaves on board the brig Hermosa, which was wrecked; and the slaves, when saved from the wreck, were taken to one of the British islands and liberated; and they prayed Congress to take measures to obtain from that government indemnity for their loss. On presenting this petition, Mr. Barrow is reported to have said, "It was time this question was met and contested by this government, so that we might know what we had to expect." He further said:

"He wished the case he had presented to be acted upon on its own merits. *He wished the Senate to speak, and the House of Representatives also*, that the nation might hear, and the government of Great Britain know, what were our opinions and our determination upon the subject. Great Britain had undertaken to draw a distinction between property in slaves, and other property, goods, wares, and merchandise. The South would be the last who would submit to this distinction. Property at the South was not now safe. If contemptible British officers were permitted to trample under foot the law of nations, and this nation refused to throw its broad mantle over us, we would be compelled to fit out cruisers, and go and destroy Nassau and all those ports from which these vessels came. The case he had presented was not less important than that of the Creole, although that involved a new principle; and he hoped the committee on foreign relations would express its opinion on the subject."

On the same occasion, Mr. Calhoun is reported to have expressed himself strongly in regard to the Creole case. "He considered the outrage as one without a parallel. He believed, when fairly presented to the British government, the case would be one which would show so great an outrage, that it would be redressed. If it was not, there was not a man who had an American heart in his bosom, whose hand would not be raised against it."

Mr. King, of Alabama, said:

"The subject, he hoped, would be entered upon by the committee on foreign relations, the correspondence called for by that committee, and every thing relating to this great and paramount question, laid before the Senate and the country. The memorial presented a statement of facts to the Senate which ought to excite alarm, and which called for such action on the part of Congress as would place the country in a proper condition of defense."

I do not propose to comment upon these warlike demonstrations of honorable senators, in which they say distinctly, if we do not protect them in the slave trade, they will themselves commence a war with England. I cannot agree with honorable senators, that every man having *an American heart will raise his hand in protection of the "slave trade."* But I wish to call particular attention to the desire of senators to have the correspondence respecting the Creole called forth, and that the subject "*should be discussed in the Senate and in the House of Representatives.*" This was a correct expression. It was made by a senator who is perfectly familiar with legislative rules and practices. He spoke the views of that whole body upon that point; for no one expressed a doubt of the propriety of such discussion. I will only say, that on the 10th of January last, Mr. Calhoun offered a resolution, calling for all papers relating to the case of the Creole. On the 11th of the same month, it came up for adoption, and an incidental discussion arose upon the motion of an honorable senator to introduce an amendment corresponding with the language of the Constitution, by substituting the word *persons*, instead of *slaves.* The resolution was adopted, and communication made by the President. On the 4th of February following, another discussion arose incidentally in the Senate, upon a question of reference of the executive communication upon the subject.—At a subsequent day, Mr. Walker, a Senator from Mississippi, introduced another resolution, calling for all *further* correspondence in regard to the Creole, which was adopted; and on the 21st of February a copy of the important letter of instructions furnished by the Secretary of State to our minister at London, was transmitted to the Senate That letter was highly extolled by senators, and, together with the remarks of senators on those four occasions, *since the case of the Creole happened, and while that matter was a subject of negotiation*, together with the resolutions of that body, and the report in the House, to which I have alluded, was published and sent forth to the people of this nation. These resolutions, the report, the speeches of senators, and the letter of the Secretary of State, all indicated a determination to involve the free States and the nation in a war for the purpose of sustaining the slave trade; and that, too, as I believed, in violation of our plain constitutional rights. These demonstrations appeared to be necessary to prepare the minds of the people of the northern States for such an event. The public press very properly entered upon the discussion; and I regret to say that some northern papers appeared to favor the doctrine, that the federal government are bound to aid and protect the slave dealers of the South, by our wealth, and our lives, if necessary; and they urged as an argument, that Congress *appeared* to entertain the same opinion, for they urged that "no contrary doctrine had been advanced in either House."

The venerable member from Massachusetts, Mr. Adams, was naturally looked to for his views upon the subject. He, however, stood at the head of the committee on foreign relations, and it was expected he would speak (if at all) as the organ of that committee. But a clear majority of that committee were from the slave States; and, as I supposed, would paralyze every attempt of that statesman and patriot to call up the attention of the people to the danger which threatened them. I counselled with other members, all of whom accorded with me in the opinion that some member ought to bring forward some proposition upon the subject; and it was urged by them, that as I had bestowed some thought upon the matter, I ought to state my views to the country. I saw, or thought I saw, an attempt to involve our country in what appeared to me a dishonorable and an unconstitutional war.—There was at least a most palpable attempt to commit the nation fully to the support of the slave trade, in total disregard of the constitutional rights of the free States. I had solemnly sworn to support that Constitution which I believed would soon be violated in a point the most vital to the interest and the honor of the free States, as well as the district which I represented. I was placed in this situation. I had no other alternative than to do what I deemed a sworn duty, or tamely to shrink before the anticipated frowns of those who legislate not by the force of reason and truth, but by means of that unparalleled tyranny which can silence a member who disagrees with them, while they assail him with coarse, personal epithets, and attempt to brand him as *infamous*, for the sole reason that he dares to express his opinion upon matters of national importance. The country is aware that I had learned, from actual experience, the peril which had so long attended every attempt to assert the rights of the North upon the floor of the House of Representatives. But I was also aware that ninety thousand people, constituting a portion of the sovereign power of these States, had generously confided to me, as their representative, the protection of their rights. With a solemn sense of my responsibility to you, fellow-citizens, to the people of this nation, and to posterity, as well as to my own reputation, and the reputation of those who in coming time shall bear my name, I presented the resolutions which are before the country. I believe it impossible to refer to an instance in which the *right* or the *propriety* of a member to discuss any subject of controversy between our government and that of another nation, was ever denied. You are all aware that the subject of our northeastern boundary has been a matter of negotiation for more than twenty years. During almost every session of Congress within that time, it has been discussed. Since the affair of the Caroline took place upon the Niagara frontier, that subject has been under negotiation between this government and that of Great Britain; but no session of Congress, it is believed, has transpired during that time, in which resolutions upon that subject have not been introduced and discussed in both branches of Congress. But was any member ever charged with impropriety for agitating it while it was a matter of negotiation? No, fellow-citizens; such a thing was never heard of until the cry raised against me by southern men, for presuming to deny the right of Congress to tax you for the benefit of the slave trade. So loudly have they denounced me on that account, that many northern editors seem to have been led without reflection to the admission that there was some slight grounds for such charge.

I have felt it necessary to make these short explanations of the circumstances and reasons which induced me to offer the resolutions, merely in justification of the *propriety* of bringing them forward. On this point I am aware that many editors have assailed me, and like my accusers in the House of Representatives, have accused me *unheard.* Of this I do not complain. I have lived too long, and seen too much of human nature, to suppose that any man, publicly assailed by a large majority of the House of Representatives, would receive the unqualified approbation of those who had not the means of knowing the reasons that guided, or the motives that impelled him to action. I hope such papers will now do me so much justice as to inform their readers of the facts to which I have alluded. I have stated some of my views in regard to constitutional rights. I would claim for them only a fair and candid consideration; such as should be awarded to the opinions of every man. I give them also an explanation of the course which I have pursued. If you deem them erroneous, I answer, they are such as I considered correct, and felt myself bound to act in accordance with them.

Some editors, who appear friendly to the rights of the North, and willing to justify my right and privilege to present the resolutions, and who also deny the doctrine that members of Congress, or other citizens, are under any obligations to remain silent while the executive opinions are published and promulgated among the people, still express the opinion that my resolutions were "*ill-timed.*" Why they consider them so, does not appear; nor have they stated how long the members of the House were bound to hold their peace, when they solemnly believed an effort was making to plunge the nation into an unjust, unconstitutional, and dishonorable war. I offered the resolutions at the first moment permitted by the rules of the House during the present session; and I had good reason to believe that our State would not again be called for resolutions more than once during its present session. If I were correct in this view, I could not hope to get them acted on at this session, unless presented on that day.—But I see other editors urge that they occupied the time of the House, which should have been appropriated to important public business. I deemed the subject of peace and war quite as important as any other that was before us. Indeed, I thought a few hours would have been spent upon this question with quite as much propriety as they would have been in listening to the almost intermidable speeches which usually occupy that body. Yet I did not propose to spend one moment upon the subject, at that time. I only wished to lay them before the country; and when they should be printed and considered by members, I intended at some future day to ask the House to reject or pass them; for I well knew, and every other member of the House knew that they could not be legitimately discussed at [illegible] session, without a suspension of the rules, which I neither hoped nor expected. Had the House been brought to a vote upon these resolutions, they would not probably have occupied more than about twenty minutes. But I appeal to the judgment of a candid and intelligent community, fully confident that not an individual can be found, who believes that one of those who voted to censure me for presenting those resolutions, would have hesitated to *thank* me, had my resolutions declared the duty of the federal government to obtain indemnity for the slaves shipped on board the Creole. Nor do I think any one will doubt that my sole offense consisted in presenting to the country the *northern* side of the question, instead of the *southern* view of it.

I feel called upon, fellow-citizens, to express to you my regret and mortification at seeing the attempts of some few editors to impugn my motives, and to stigmatize my acts, in regard to these resolutions, by attaching to them the epithet of "*abolition.*" Unwilling to point out any error, or to assign any reason for their opposition to the doctrines contained in them, they nevertheless appear to feel it a duty to lend their influence to oppose any effect which they may have on the public mind, in favor of northern rights. That northern men, who have been bred and educated in the love of freedom, have enjoyed its blessings and witnessed its benefits upon the world, can feel willing to oppose the interests of the free States, and to treat with contempt their own constitutional rights and liberties, by resorting to the use of unmeaning names and epithets, and an appeal to the prejudices instead of the judgment of mankind, is, and must ever be, a matter of unspeakable pain and sorrow to every patriotic heart. Duty to you and to our country, requires me to say, that this feeling among many of our honest and virtuous citizens, presents no small difficulty with which your legislators and statesmen have to contend. I have seen the bosoms of our aged patriots heave with emotion, and their cheeks bathed in tears, when conversing upon the fact that northern men—men who are virtuous and patriotic, and who agree upon every *principle* of national policy, are nevertheless willing to separate from, and contend with, each other about mere *names;* and this, too, in the face of those who are trampling on our rights by the most high-handed tyranny. Nay, so far do they seem willing to carry their imaginary differences, that they even regard it a duty to strike down the arm that is raised to defend themselves, their children, and the honor of their country. All are aware that the resolution of censure was passed upon me in consequence of my efforts to sustain what I believed to be the constitutional rights of the free States, and of the people whom I represented. I defy my most inveterate enemy to point to a single act or vote in my official life, which has, in any degree, invaded the rights of the slave States, or any of my fellow-members. Elected by you, I felt bound carefully to watch, and assiduously to guard, your rights, your interests, and your honor; and I fearlessly challenge those who now assail me with the unmeaning epithet of "abolition," to point to an instance in which I have neglected that duty. If those who now speak so freely of "abolition," will stand forth and boldly assert the duty of you, fellow-citizens, and of the people of the free States, to wage a war, expend your wealth, and shed your blood, to enable the slave dealers of the South to transport their cargoes of human flesh upon the high seas, I shall then be able to meet them understandingly; but until they do this, I cannot make further reply.

This represen'ation of your views, your wishes, and interests, fellow-citizens, constitutes the principal characteristic of a representative government. When this privilege shall be denied, ours will cease to be a *representative* government. It will no longer be a government of the people; for the people's will can no longer control its action. Cut off from this privilege, and no longer controlling its actions, they will be acted on, and their will must be controlled by those who wield the governmental power.

You, fellow-citizens, have interests, of which the representatives from Maine or Georgia may not be informed. Indeed, such may be your interests, that not another member in Congress, except your own immediate representative, will understand them.—It is therefore necessary that each representative should act for himself and his constituents, independently of the views or interests of other members; and this principle is equally applicable to matters of general policy as it is to local interests. On each and all these subjects it is the clear, indisputable and constitutional right and privilege of each district in the United States, to be heard through its representative. You deputed to me the right to represent *your* views, and not those of the district represented by Mr. Botts, of Virginia.—His district has interests distinct from yours. The breeding and exportation of slaves, constitutes perhaps, "*the most vital interest*" of his people. In that business you have no legal or constitutional concern whatever; nor did you, when you bestowed upon me your suffrages, expect me to ask the permission or advice of that gentleman upon matters connected with the slave-trading interest. It must be an object with him and his people to obtain from your hard earnings, from the substance acquired by your toil and labor, funds to guard and protect them in this business, which they deem legitimate and honorable; while it is as palpably conducive to your interests to be exempt from such taxation.—He has represented the views of his people, according to his judgment, without censure from me or any other member. But I leave you and the country to judge whether the same right has been enjoyed by you and your representative. It was my undoubted privilege, it was my solemn duty, to act in accordance with your views and interests; and to you alone, and the people of this nation, was I responsible. I stood on that floor a *freeman*, representing a portion of the *free and independent sovereign people of this nation.* I acknowledge no superintending human power, except that of your will; nor could I, while acting in the discharge of that high trust, admit the right of any human being, whether he were "*a high functionary of government,*" a fellow-member, a peasant in his field, or the President in his palace, to interfere with, or control my action, in what I believed to be your will, your interest, or your honor. Nor could I, in any degree whatever, admit the right of a majority of the House to interfere in the discharge of that trust which you had reposed in me. But on this point, as I believe the entire press of the northern States, and the unanimous voice of all political parties, sustain the right which I saw fit to exercise, I will detain you with no further remarks. It was with these views that I entered upon an investigation of the doctrines contained in the resolutions of the Senate, to which I have alluded, and which had been so frequently advanced in the Senate, and in the House of Representatives, and lastly in the letter of the honorable Secretary of State. After much labor and research, and the most mature reflection and thought, I embodied my own conclusions in a series of resolutions which are now before the country. I believe there is not a principle of national or municipal law embraced in them, which has not received the sanction of the highest courts of judicature within most of the slave States and of the free States of this Union, as well as in the courts of the United States, and the English courts, and of the jurists and statesmen of other civilized nations.—Nor do I think an adjudication of any court of authority can be found, in which is denied a single principle embraced in those resolutions. Yet whether they be correct in doctrine or not, is wholly immaterial. It is sufficient for my purpose to say, that I verily deem them correct. I believed they spoke the views of nearly every man in this district; and I solemnly declare, before that God to whom I am accountable, that in presenting them to the House of Representatives, I acted solely from considerations of imperative duty. I did not, however, present them to the consideration of the House, without reflection, nor until I had consulted with such members as I felt were entitled to my confidence, and in whose prudence, judgment, and patriotism, I know you would have desired me to rely, in any case where I desired counsel. The scene that followed their presentation, you are already acquainted with. That procedure was entirely unexpected to me. I had supposed my resolutions would probably cause some sensation among southern members; but I had never dreamed that they would excite such a maddened frenzy, as would lead to the striking asunder of the last cord which binds a people to their government. No, fellow-citizens; although I had seen your respectful petitions treated with the most supercilious contempt by your servants, and indignantly scouted from the Hall of Representatives—although I had, in my own person, seen the freedom of debate repeatedly denied, and my own lips hermetically sealed, while attempting to assert what I believed to be your constitutional rights—although I had seen an honorable and highly distinguished member of the House, a man venerable for his learning, his talents, his age, his public services, and his patriotic devotion to his country, and whose fame had spread throughout the civilized world, arraigned like a base felon at the bar of the House, for daring to lay before that body the respectful prayer of a portion of the sovereign people; yet the thought had not occurred to my mind, that a majority of that body would, by a vote of censure, *dare* to strike at the character and standing of a member, for *laying before them his honest views, or the views of the people whom he represented.*

As to the proceedings upon that most extraordinary trial, I have but little to say. At the first proper moment, I asked time to prepare such a defense as would maintain your honor and the honor of your representative. This was my right and the right of my constituents. It was so declared by the Speaker, and by him ably maintained to the extent of his power. To deprive me of this privilege, the member who introduced the resolution at the bidding of Mr. Botts, called for the previous question. This was done as deliberately as any other act of the House during that unparalleled proceeding. The vote was about to be taken, when that member *insultingly* said, "If my colleague will rise in his place and say that he wishes to make a defense *now*, I will withdraw the call for the previous question." I did not feel that I had been placed in the councils of the nation by the authority of your suffrages, *mainly to seek for favors, or to ask for mercy, at the hands of a political opponent;* particularly one who had condescended to act as the dishonorable instrument of another's malice. He professed to hold *my* privileges, and the privileges of ninety thousand of the free and sovereign people of our gallant State, at the mercy of his will. I had, as it were but a moment previously, stated that a week from Thursday following would be as short a time as I could prepare my defense. But he sought thus to force me into an instantaneous defense against one of the most extraordinary and unheard of proceedings that has ever marked our country's history; and that, too, without arrangement, without system without a moment's preparation, without documents, and without authorities. Indeed, the offer was without a precedent and without a parallel. Yet even then I should have been pleased with an opportunity to have expressed my indignation at so degrading an offer; but the Speaker interposed by inquiring of him, whether he withdrew the motion for the previous question, which he must do *unconditionally* or not at all. He refused to withdraw the motion, and at the instance and on motion of a representative from our own State, the previous question was called and insisted upon for the *express purpose of preventing any defense.* This motion was sustained by about the same number of votes as was the resolution of censure. The Speaker decided that the previous question could not cut me off from defending myself on a resolution where my honor or the honor of my constituents was concerned. From this decision of the Speaker an appeal was taken, and debated; and upon a full and deliberate consideration, the decision of the Speaker was overruled, *with the express and avowed intention of cutting me off from any defense whatever.* This was the second solemn vote of the House in which that body distinctly decided that *I should not be heard.* Yet I have heard that one or two papers have asserted that I might have defended myself had I desired to do so. But I have never seen such a statement in any paper. On the contrary, I think that not one of the great number of reports of that trial given to the public *at the time*, has failed to inform its readers that I was not permitted to defend myself.

After the previous question had been sustained, and the House had directed, by their vote, that it should be applied to me, it became the duty of the Speaker to enforce the order thus made. And when I afterwards attempted to address the House, he informed me, with great mildness, that the House had decided that the rule should be strictly enforced against me; and from that moment he faithfully obeyed the instructions of the House, nor did he at any time permit me to be heard in any manner whatever, except when it was proposed to hear me by universal consent. I then commenced reading the note which I had previously prepared, and which will be found in the report hereto annexed.* I had read but a part of the first sentence when I was called to order, and resumed my seat, as I was bound by the rules of the House to do. After I had taken my seat, Mr. Cooper withdrew his objection, which was instantly renewed by Mr. Calhoun, of Massachusetts, agreeably to the statement hereunto annexed. This latter fact does not appear from the report in the National Intelligencer, which I have thought proper to publish. The reporter for that paper either did not hear Mr. Calhoun, or was unable to note it at the time. It is however, due to that honorable member, that I should say, I understood his objection to have been made with no desire to embarrass me, but to prevent the example which would be set by permitting a member to speak under such circumstances. I had for some time been trying to read the note to which I have alluded, but had failed, and I then added the caption to it, and sent it to the reporter. I should have deemed these facts unnecessary, had not my accusers attempted on the day following to avoid the just odium of their own acts, by representing that I might have spoken by general consent if I had chosen to do so. So far from this being correct, I could not read my short note, when I made many and frequent attempts to do so. It is true that Mr. Stanley and others called on me to proceed, and said that I might be heard; but it is equally true that *others* objected to hearing me, and that I could speak only by *universal consent*, and while there was one individual who objected I could not proceed. There was no time when there was such universal consent, except when I commenced addressing the House; and I was then stopped before I had uttered one sentence. After that I had no opportunity whatever. Had I enjoyed the privilege of reading my note, I should have done so. But I should not have attempted a defense while I was placed at the mercy of each member, who would have had the power to stop me when he pleased. The acceptance of such a proposal would have been dishonorable to me as a representative, and disgraceful to my constituents.

When the previous question was sustained, and I found there was no further opportunity for me to defend your rights or my own, I began to reflect what step I should take in order so far as in my power to maintain your honor, and my own reputation. By the vote of censure, I ceased, or was substantially forbidden, to represent your interests or views, unless I could first obtain the consent of a majority to such measures as I felt bound to offer to the House. For me to remain in my seat would be construed into a tacit admission on my part, that the House had the right to censure me. It would constitute a precedent which might be followed hereafter. I should from that time be regarded as acting under the surveillance of the majority. My seat would be regarded as dishonored, so far as the vote of a majority of the House had weight and influence. Under these circumstances, no personal consideration could have detained me a moment after the consummation of such an outrage. Upon a moment's reflection, I became satisfied that my duty to you as well as myself, required me to resign my office, and to submit my conduct to the judgment of those in whose name and for whose benefit I had acted. I stated my views to an honorable friend and colleague, who consulted with such of our other whig colleagues as he could conveniently converse with at the time. He returned and informed me that they unanimously approved of my views. I remained in my seat during the formality of calling and reading the yeas and nays, and when the result was announced, I immediately took leave of my friends and withdrew from the hall. Arrived at my lodgings, I wrote a letter of resignation to the Speaker, and another to the Executive of our own State, requesting that an election might be ordered as soon as convenient, in order that you should be no longer unrepresented than necessary. I then arranged what business had been confided to my official care, left the city, and am now with you.

Of the facts and doctrines asserted in the preamble and resolution of censure, it was not my purpose to speak in detail. I have neither time to do so at present, nor would your patience be commensurate with a just exposure of their falsity and errors. I will only say, that so far as the preamble asserts the slave trade to be "*the most vital interest of a large portion of the Union,*" and of its being of a *delicate* nature, and the prospect of its embroiling "this nation and the whole civilized world in a war," and so far as it asserts the duty of good citizens, to unite in bringing on such a war, or in submitting the question of war or peace to "a high functionary of government," I leave them to the dictates of your moral feelings and judgments. It would be a work of supererogation at this age of the world, to speak of them to an enlightened, a moral, and virtuous constituency, however they may be treated by a tyrannical majority in the halls of Congress. To suppose that any constituent of mine were so heterodox in his political faith, or so ignorant of his constitutional rights, as to yield up the invaluable privilege of being heard by his representative upon the subject of peace or war, or to admit the doctrine that a "high functionary of government," was to be the sole arbiter of our nation's honor and interest; I say, to imagine such a possibility, would be a reproach upon your intelligence and patriotism.

But when Mr. Botts, or a majority of the House of Representatives, assert that the resolutions which I submitted, justify *mutiny* or *murder*, it becomes my duty to repel such an unfounded charge.

Mutiny is the illegal resistance of *lawful authority*, to which the mutineers have become voluntarily subject. Thus, for soldiers to resist the authority of their officers, or for sailors to resist the authority of their captain or his mates, would constitute *mutiny.* But my resolutions assert in terms that the persons on board the Creole were not *legally* subject to the captain or any other officer. They had never enlisted as sailors or soldiers, nor had the captain authority over them in any *legal sense.* They were freemen, voluntarily emancipated, and the captain was carrying them into slavery. They were under no more legal obligations to submit to the captain's authority, than Mr. Botts would have been under, had he been forced on board said vessel for the purpose of being sold into African slavery.

As to the crime of murder, they were no more legally guilty of that, than Mr. Botts would have been, had he been forced on board said ship for the purpose of being sold into African slavery, and in striving to free himself he had slain one of those who held him captive. I speak in a *legal* sense.—There was no law of any State or nation that authorized the captain to hold them in subjection as slaves; and they violated no *law* in asserting their liberty.

To illustrate my views more clearly, I will call your attention to the fact, that in 1803 there were many American citizens held as slaves in Africa, by the Bey of Tripoli. Suppose those Americans had been shipped on board of a slave vessel for Derne, to be there sold as slaves, and while at sea they had risen and asserted their liberty. Suppose those who held them captive, preferring the loss of their own lives to the loss of their slaves, had attempted by force to subdue them. Would AMERICANS have hesitated to maintain their liberty, even at the expense of the lives of those who assailed them? And would Mr. Botts, or those who voted to censure me, have declared such an act to be "MUTINY AND MURDER?" And to carry out the analogy which I have commenced, I will suppose that such persons having obtained command of the ship, had taken her to Gibraltar, then in the occupation of the British government, and had there sought freedom; would our Hon. Secretary of State have argued the duty of the British government to surrender up our fellow-citizens to African slavery?

It is not my purpose to comment upon the nature of the extraordinary proceeding which called forth my resignation. I leave that to the public press and statesmen, whose duty it is properly to characterize that high-handed and unparalleled transaction. But I desire to express my sincere pleasure at witnessing the manner in which the northern press generally have treated the subject; I refer to the press of both political parties. They appear to have laid aside all feelings but those of patriotism, and to have united in a determination to expose the outrage committed upon your rights in the person of your representative. I feel bound also to mention the fact, that the vote in the House of Representatives was not a *strict party vote.* There were seven members of the democratic party from the free States who voted against the resolution of censure. Among them were three from the city of New-York, the representatives of Tammany Hall, the fountain of northern democracy. I mention it as an evidence that the time is not far distant when northern men will stand forth united in defense of northern rights; when it will not be considered disreputable or worthy of public censure, for a member of Congress to maintain and defend the rights of his constituents, although they may live in the free States. The entire whig delegation from the free States (except six) opposed the resolution of censure; while the whole representation from the slave States, consisting of both political parties, with two honorable exceptions, (Messrs. Underwood and Pope, of Kentucky,) together with all but seven of the so-called democratic party from the free States, voted in favor of it. It was this alliance between the representatives of the slave States, and most of the democratic party of the free States, that brought to the support of the resolution so heavy a majority.

Fellow-Citizens: In resigning back to you the trust which you have so generously reposed in me, I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude for the kindness and favor which you have at all times manifested towards me. You first called me from the walks of humble life to represent you in the State legislature. You further honored me with the distinguished marks of your approbation by an election to Congress. After an expiration of two years you re-elected me by a larger majority than was received by any other member of the present House of Representatives. For these repeated evidences of your kindness, I tender you my sincere gratitude; and I assure you while memory performs its office, I shall ever look back upon the relation which has subsisted between us with the most lively emotions.

I may also be permitted to say, that while representing your interests at the seat of the Federal Government, I have to the full extent of my physical and intellectual energies, guarded your interests, your constitutional rights, and your honor. My official acts are now before you; they are open to the scrutiny of all. I ask for them no other favor than a generous constituency are ever disposed to grant. A large majority of the House of Representatives have pronounced them "worthy of the severe condemnation of the people of this country." This declaration I denounce as unwarranted and unconstitutional; a flagrant violation of your rights; subversive of the representative privileges, and at war with the most vital principles of our institutions. You are to judge between us, fellow-citizens. The eyes of the people of this nation are upon you. Your action is to have a momentous bearing upon the future destinies of your country, especially upon the rights of the North and of the free States. If you, by the expression of those sentiments which become a free, enlightened, moral, and virtuous people, boldly maintain your own rights and the rights of the North, you will thereby strengthen the hands and encourage the hearts of those public servants who are now watching your movements with an intensity of feeling, and a patriotic anxiety, which cannot be expressed. That such will be your course I entertain no doubt. I entertain entire confidence that you will act as becomes AMERICAN FREEMEN.

I am, fellow-citizens, your obedient servant,

J. R. GIDDINGS.

Jefferson, April 5, 1842.

* This note was published in the Standard, at the time.

THE RIGHT OF SEARCH—LORD ABERDEEN'S REPLY TO THE NOTE OF MR. STEVENSON.

The undersigned, &c. has the honor of addressing Mr. Everett, &c.; the observations which he feels called upon to make, in answer to the note of Mr. Stevenson, dated on the 21st of October.

As that communication only reached the hands of the undersigned, on the day after the departure of Mr. Stevenson from London, on his return to America, and as there has since been no Minister or Chargé d'Affaires from the United States, resident in this country, the undersigned has looked with some anxiety for the arrival of Mr. Everett, in order that he might be enabled to renew his diplomatic intercourse with an accredited representative of the Republic. Had the undersigned entertained no other purpose, than to controvert the argument of Mr. Stevenson, or to fortify his own, in treating of the matter which has formed the subject of their correspondence, he would have experienced little impatience; but, as it is his desire to clear up doubt, and to remove misapprehension, he feels that he cannot too early avail himself of the presence of Mr. Everett at his post, to bring to his knowledge the true state of the question at issue.

The undersigned agress with Mr. Stevenson, in the importance of arriving at a clear understanding of the matter really in dispute. This ought to be the first object in the differences of States, as well as of individuals; and, happily, it is often the first step to the reconciliation of the parties. In the present case, this understanding is doubly essential; because a continuance of mistake and error may be productive of the most serious consequences.

Mr. Stevenson persists in contending that the British government assert a right, which is equivalent to the claim of searching American vessels in time of peace. In proof of this, Mr. Stevenson refers to a passage in a former note of Viscount Palmerston, addressed to himself, against which he strongly protests, and the doctrine contained in which, he says that the undersigned is understood to affirm.

Now, it is not the intention of the undersigned, to inquire into the precise import and force of the expressions of Viscount Palmerston. These might have been easily explained to Mr. Stevenson, by their author, at the time they were written; but the undersigned must request that his doctrines on this subject, and those of the government of which he is the organ, may be judged of exclusively from his own declarations.

The undersigned again renounces, as he has already done, in the most explicit terms, any right on the part of the British government, to search American vessels, in time of peace. The right of search, except when specially conceded by treaty, is a purely belligerent right, and can have no existence on the high seas during peace. The undersigned apprehends, however, that the right of search is not confined to the verification of the nationality of the vessel, but also extends to the object of the voyage, and the nature of the cargo. The sole purpose of the British cruisers is, to ascertain whether the vessels they meet with, are really American or not. The right asserted has, in truth, no resemblance to the right of search, either in principle or in practice. It is simply a right to satisfy the party, who has a legitimate interest in knowing the truth, that the vessel is what her colors announce. This right we concede, as freely as we exercise. The British cruisers are not instructed to detain American vessels, under any circumstances whatever; on the contrary, they are ordered to abstain from all interference with them, be they slavers or otherwise. But, where reasonable suspicion exists, that the American flag has been abused, for the purpose of covering the vessel of another nation, it would appear scarcely credible, had it not been made manifest by the repeated protestations of their representative, that the government of the United States, which has stigmatised and abolished the trade itself, should object to the adoption of such means, as are indispensably necessary for ascertaining the truth.

The undersigned had contended, in his former note, that the legitimate inference from the arguments of Mr. Stevenson, would practically extend even to the sanction of piracy, when the persons engaged in it should think fit to shelter themselves under the flag of the United States. Mr. Stevenson observes, that this is a misapprehension on the part of the undersigned; and he declares, that in denying the right of interfering with vessels under the American flag, he intended to limit his objection to vessels bona fide American, and not to those belonging to nations who might fraudulently have assumed the flag of the United States. But it appears to the undersigned, that his former statement is by no means satisfactorily controverted, by the declaration of Mr. Stevenson. How is this bona fide to be proved? Must not Mr. Stevenson either be prepared to maintain, that the flag alone is sufficient evidence of the nationality of the vessel, which, in the face of his own repeated assertions, he cannot do; or must he not confess, that the application of his arguments would really afford protection to every lawless and piratical enterprise?

The undersigned had also expressed his belief, that the practice was general of ascertaining, by visit, the real character of any vessel on the high seas, against which there should exist reasonable ground of suspicion. Mr. Stevenson denies this, and he asks what other nation than Great Britain has ever asserted, or attempted to exercise, such a right. In answer to this question, the undersigned can at once refer to the avowed and constant practice of the United States, whose cruisers, especially in the Gulf of Mexico, by the admission of their public journals, are notoriously in the habit of examining all suspicious vessels, whether sailing under the English flag or any other. In whose eyes are these vessels suspicious? Doubtless, in those of the commanders of the American cruisers. But, in truth, this right is quite as important to the United States as to Great Britain; nor is it easy to conceive how the maritime intercourse of mankind could be safely carried on without such a check.

It can scarcely be necessary to remind Mr. Everett, that the right thus claimed by Great Britain is not exercised for any selfish purpose. It is asserted in the interest of humanity, and in mitigation of the sufferings of our fellow-men. The object has met with the concurrence of the whole civilized world, including the United States of America; and it ought to receive universal assistance and support.

The undersigned cannot abstain here from referring to the conduct of an honorable and zealous officer, commanding the naval force of the United States on the coast of Africa, who, relying on the sincere desire of his government for the suppression of the slave trade, and sensible of the abuse of the American flag, entered into an engagement on the 11th of March, 1840, with the officer in command of her majesty's cruisers on the same station, by which they mutually requested each other, and agreed to detain all vessels under American colors employed in the traffic. If found to be American property, such vessels were to be delivered over to the commander of any American cruiser on the station; or, if belonging to other nations, they were to be dealt with according to the treaties contracted by her majesty with the respective States. The undersigned believes, and, indeed, after the statements of Mr. Stevenson, he regrets to be unable to doubt, that the conduct of this gallant officer, however natural and laudable in its object, has been disavowed by his government.

It is not the intention of the undersigned, at present to advocate the justice and propriety of the mutual right of search, as conceded and regulated by treaty; or to weigh the reasons on account of which this proposal has been rejected by the government of the United States. He took occasion, in a former note, to observe, that concessions sanctioned by Great Britain and France, were not likely to be incompatible with the dignity and independence of any other State, which should be disposed to follow their example. But the undersigned begs to inform Mr. Everett, that he has this day concluded a joint treaty with France, Austria, Russia, and Prussia, by which the mutual right of search, within certain latitudes, is fully and effectually established for ever. This is, in truth, a holy alliance, in which the undersigned would have rejoiced to see the United States assume their proper place among the great powers of christendom, foremost in power, wealth and civilization, and connected together in the cause of mercy and justice.

It is, undoubtedly, true that this right may be abused, like every other which is delegated to many and different hands. It is possible that it may be exercised wantonly and vexatiously; and, should this be the case, it would not only call for remonstrance, but would justify resentment. This, however, is in the highest degree improbable, and if, in spite of the utmost caution, an error should be committed, and any American vessel should suffer loss or injury, it would be followed by prompt and ample reparation. The undersigned begs to repeat, that, with American vessels, whatever be their destination, British cruisers have no pretensions in any manner to interfere. Such vessels must be permitted, if engaged in it, to enjoy a monopoly of this unhallowed trade; but the British government will never endure that the fraudulent use of the American flag shall extend the iniquity to other nations by whom it is abhorred, and who have entered into solemn treaties with this country for its entire suppression.

In order to prove to Mr. Everett the anxiety of her majesty's government to prevent all reasonable ground of complaint, the undersigned believes that he cannot do better than to communicate to him the substance of those instructions under which the British cruisers act in relation to American vessels when employed on this service.

If, from the intelligence which the officer commanding her majesty's cruiser may have received, or from the manœuvres of the vessel, or from other sufficient cause, he shall have reason to believe that, although bearing the American flag, the vessel does not belong to the United States, he is ordered, if the state of the wind and weather shall admit of it, to go ahead of the suspected vessel, after communicating his intention by hailing, and to drop a boat on board of her, to ascertain her nationality, without detaining her if she shall prove to be really an American vessel. But, should this mode of visiting the vessel be impracticable, he is to require her to be brought to for this purpose. The officer who boards the vessel is merely to satisfy himself of her nationality, by her papers or other proofs; and, should she really be an American vessel, he will immediately quit her, offering, with the consent of her commander, to note on her papers the cause of suspecting her nationality, and the number of minutes she was detained (if detained at all) for the object in question. All the particulars are to be immediately entered in the log-book of the cruiser, and a full statement of them is to be sent by the first opportunity direct to England.

These are the precautions taken by her majesty's government against the occurrence of abuse in the performance of this service; and they are ready to adopt any others which they may think more effectual for the purpose, and which shall, at the same time, be consistent with the attainment of the main object in view.

Mr. Stevenson has said, that he had no wish to exempt the fraudulent use of the American flag from detection; and this being the case, the undersigned is unwilling to believe that a government like that of the United States, professing the same object, and animated by the same motives as Great Britain, should seriously oppose themselves to every possible mode by which their own desire could be really accomplished.

Foreign office, December, 20, 1841.

ADMIT TEXAS INTO THE UNION.

Resolutions of the General Assembly of Alabama, in favor of the admission of Texas into the Union, January 21, 1842.—Ordered to be printed.

Resolved unanimously by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Alabama in General Assembly convened, First: That with the rising prospects of the new and noble republic of Texas, the reasons why we should not forbid, but rather seek earnestly her admission into our Union, constantly and rapidly accumulate; "their people are our people," and we believe them to be bold, fearless friends of liberty; their admission cannot weaken, but will add strength, wealth, and power, to the Union. Second:

Resolved unanimously, That it is hereby made known to Texas and to the world, that, we, as the representatives of the people of Alabama, are decidedly in favor of the admission of the republic of Texas into the Union, with equal rights, and upon an equal footing, with the sovereign States of the United States of America. Third:

Resolved unanimously, That the Governor of Alabama, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in behalf of their respective Houses, be requested to subscribe these resolutions, either before, or immediately after the adjournment of this general assembly; that his excellency the governor, be requested to forward a copy to the governor of each of the States and territories; a copy to the President of Texas; and also a copy to each of our senators and representatives in Congress, requesting them to urge the passage of all such laws, resolutions, or treaties, as may conduce to the desirable object of the annexation of the republic of Texas to the United States of America.—[Approved, January 1, 1842.]

A true copy. Attest

WM. GARRATT, *Secretary of State.*

Resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, for the admission of Texas into the Union, &c. March 14, 1842.—Referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Preamble and resolutions in favor of the admission of Texas into the Union, with equal rights, and upon an equal footing, with the sovereign States of these United States of America.

Whereas the people of Texas have evinced an unconquerable love of liberty, by their Spartan firmness in the Alamo, and their heroic conduct at San Jacinto; and whereas the same people have proved their capacity for self-government, by the adoption of their free and republican constitution and laws—

Be it therefore resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, That our representatives in Congress be requested to use every exertion in their power to procure the admission of Texas into the Union, with equal rights, and upon an equal footing, with the sovereign States of these United States of America.

Resolved, That the Governor of Tennessee, the Speaker of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in behalf of their respective Houses, be requested to subscribe these resolutions; and that his excellency the governor be requested to forward a copy to the governor of each of the States and territories of the Union, and a copy to the President of Texas.

Resolved, That this General Assembly approve of the joint resolutions unanimously adopted by the legislature of Alabama, at its late session, on this subject, and transmitted to this General Assembly through his excellency the governor.—[Approved February 7, 1842.

Resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, in favor of the admission of Texas into the Union, &c. &c.

Resolved, by the legislature of the State of Mississippi, That our senators in Congress be instructed, and our representatives be requested, to use their best exertions to procure the annexation of Texas to the United States; and that the same constitute one or more sovereign States of this Union.

Be it further resolved, That his excellency, the Governor, be requested to forward each of our senators and representatives in Congress, a copy of these resolutions, and to the governors of the several States, with a request that the same be laid before the legislatures of the several states.

Approved, Feb. 25th, 1842.

Communications.

A VOICE FROM INDIANA.

The following communication was received a long time ago, but was crowded out by articles relating to recent events:

To the Editor of the Standard:

I believe the Constitution and principles of the anti-slavery society are in accordance with the principles and the testimonies of ancient Friends; for they are in accordance with humanity and truth. I therefore believe it is right for me to promote the cause by the exertion of a moral influence; and I think I can do it much more effectually by belonging to the society, than I possibly could by standing aloof, and merely speaking favorably of its principles.

I am astonished that so many of the Society of Friends oppose this righteous movement. Is not this opposition mixing among the people, as Ephraim did of old, when strangers devoured his strength, and he knew it not? Doubtless, slaveholders dance and sing over the course pursued by the Society of Friends. They and their abettors have even been crying out, "Let us alone! Do not torment us before our time!" Few of them would indeed confess, "We know thee who thou art; the holy one of God!" But they feel that abolition principles are those of justice and equity; and they know if they are carried on in their power, their vile system will be cast out and perish. Therefore they cry aloud, "Let us alone!" And the Society of Friends respond, "Yea, keep in the quiet. God will do his own work." Doubtless, slaveholders are grateful for being thus kept in countenance; they rejoice over it in their hearts, and sing of it to all the people. Let Friends look well to the consequences of thus mixing with the spirit of slaveholders.

It is said that abolitionists work in their own time and strength; but I see no proof of this. There is one question I should like to ask; In whose strength do those work, who do nothing at all? unless it be to oppose abolition doctrines, please popular opinion, satisfy the slaveholders, and pay tithes of mint, anniss, and cummin, while they omit the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith.

I believe we might as well hold slaves, as to buy slave-labor produce; for that is the very thing that upholds the system. People would soon quit raising slave-labor produce, if nobody would buy it. If so, every one who buys is doing his part to sustain the system. Some ask, "How shall we know what *is* the produce of free labor?"

I answer, suppose we lived in a neighborhood where the milk-sickness prevailed; and some of our trustworthy neighbors assured us that they kept their cows up; could we not eat their butter freely, nothing doubting? Some say, "Free labor agents are away yonder; and what do we know about them?" I answer, the Free Labor Association is away yonder, too; and its members will keep a good look out for imposition. And even if we *are* a little imposed upon, is it not a satisfaction that we have kept our own souls guiltless?

I heard a Friend say that if we lived where slavery existed, we might perhaps do some good; but after slave-holding goods were brought here, he did not see that it made any difference who used them. I asked him if he would buy horses brought from England, if he knew them to be stolen? He said, if there was no prospect of the owner's ever finding them, he did not know that it would do any hurt. I asked whether it would not encourage them to send more; and he admitted that it would. He seemed to forget the injury that a man would do his own soul by such a traffic. I believe the opposition to abolition, if fairly traced to its origin, will be found to proceed from slavery; but it has crept into some honest minds, who have heard abolition principles so misrepresented that they are really afraid to examine for themselves. If they will only read anti-slavery books, and consent to hear the matter calmly discussed, they will see that the principles of abolitionists are founded most plainly on justice and equity; and that they rely solely on the almighty power of truth, through the instrumentality of man.

Friends in England conjure us to aid the anti-slavery cause. Shall we reject the advice they have given us in conscientious friendship? or shall we unite our efforts to theirs? A true friend to abolition.

Greensboro, Ia.

THE HARDENING INFLUENCE OF SLAVERY.

The following story was told me at Waterloo, New-York, by a gentleman who has recently had his eyes opened to the enormity of American slavery, till he abhors it without a "but," as the sum of all villanies.—After reading it, will any one ask again, "What has the North to do with slavery?" What have we to do, indeed, with a system that is hardening our hearts, corrupting our churches, and blinding the moral sense of our people to the plainest principles of right and wrong! I have no patience with those who ask, "What have the North to do with slavery?" Thus much they have to do with it, I can tell you; if they don't disconnect themselves, totally and speedily, with all partnership in that system of enormous wickedness, it will soon carry their own free institutions down to an unpitied and dishonored grave!

But here is the anecdote, to prove how the existence of slavery among us, and the habit of apologizing for it, serves to deaden the moral sense:

"A few days ago," said the gentleman, "I chanced to visit a house where a quilting party had assembled. The women were church-members, and it was soon proposed that a sermon should be read to them while they were at work. A sermon was accordingly read, on the text, "I have a few things against thee, because thou hast forsaken thy first love." In the course of remarking upon it, some allusions were made to an anti-slavery address, delivered a few evenings previous. Some justified the sentiments that had been advanced by the lecturer, others opposed them. One lady spoke very decidedly against slavery. She said she had lived in the midst of it; and told the following story: 'In the neighborhood where I lived, a man bought a girl, named Bella, or Bell, for whom he paid a very high price. She was a kind-hearted, good girl, and the young people were much attached to her. But it was soon discovered that Bell's constitution was not as good as her master had supposed when he bought her. She often complained of extreme weariness, and ill health. Her master and mistress resorted to threats and whipping; and as this did not cure her, they concluded she was lazy and obstinate, and redoubled the whipping. Unable to endure this torture, poor Bell at last summoned up resolution to run away. Her master pursued her, and overtook his trembling victim, just as she was about to enter another State, where she had hoped to find protection. He tied a rope about her neck, and fastened the other end to the back of his carriage; in this manner he compelled her to run as long as she could; when she could sustain it no longer, he bound her with the rope to the boot of the carriage, and carried her back to bondage. On her arrival, her master gave her a severe whipping, and left her in charge of her mistress, who ordered her to scour a large quantity of tin ware. When her task was about half done, she said, 'Oh, mistress, do let me lie down, just one half hour! I will get up and scour them all; but indeed I am very sick!' Her mistress ordered her to stop whining, or she would call her master, and have her whipped again. Late in the day, she finished her job; and having been compelled to eat some supper, she was sent to her lonely garret; there to pour out her sorrows before that God, who promises to hear the oppressed. In the night, a neighbor knocked at the door, and informed them that she heard such dreadful groans from Bell's garret, that she was sure she must be dying. They said there was no fear of that; for the girl had eaten supper, and gone to bed well. The neighbor, however, was too thoroughly frightened, to be pacified in this way; and she insisted that they should go to Bell's chamber, and ascertain what was the matter.—As soon as the door was opened, it was plain that the wretched girl was in the last agonies of death. Through the dark valley her soul escaped from its tyrants.'

Would you not have supposed that this story would make a deep impression on all who heard it? Was it not enough to call forth one simultaneous burst of horror against slavery? Could women be expected to listen to it without tears?

I will tell you how it *was* received. It was listened to with serious countenances; but very soon after the recital was finished, a whisper began to go round; then came a burst of laughter! and one of the women said, 'Mr. B. pray what do you think of amalgamation?'

Shame did not burn our faces to cinder; yet were we all professors of Christianity!" E. D. HUDSON.

TALES OF OPPRESSION.

BY ISAAC T. HOPPER.

No. LV.

A planter in Virginia, held a young girl as a slave. When she was about sixteen years old, being pressed for money, he sold her to a speculator, who made a business of purchasing slaves, and transporting them to the South, or West. This girl had no trace of African descent.—Her hair was straight, and her complexion quite as light as the generality of white people; and withal she was uncommonly handsome. Her new master treated her with much kindness, took her as his body servant, and made many promises of what he would do for her. She had discernment enough to discover that his intentions were not of the most honorable character; and taking the advantage of the liberty allowed, escaped to Philadelphia. She had little difficulty in her journey; for her complexion and features bore no resemblance to the African.

After remaining in that city a few years, she married a light mulatto; a sober, industrious man, who for many years, was employed in the shipyard of Joshua Humphreys, a ship carpenter of great respectability, in the district of Southwark. By frugality and industry, they were enabled to build a small, comfortable house on a lot which they had taken on ground rent. Here they appeared to possess every enjoyment their hearts could desire. Their house was neatly though economically furnished, and the floors carpeted; everything about them seemed to denote domestic comfort.

In the year 1808, about thirteen years from the time of her first arrival in Philadelphia, she was arrested as the fugitive slave of her last master, and taken before M. Keppelle, an alderman of Philadelphia. Her former master, and one or two other persons, attended as witnesses. I also attended, with my faithful friend, Thomas Harrison. Her master made his claim, and related the circumstances attending her elopement. The witnesses were examined, and her case appeared hopeless. After consulting together, and being informed by her husband, that Joshua Humphreys would advance one hundred dollars towards purchasing her freedom, we concluded to enter upon negotiation for that purpose. Previous to doing so I asked permission to have some private conversation with her; which being granted, I soon learned that she was really their slave. Thomas Harrison and myself took the claimant aside, and proposed purchasing her freedom; but he soon satisfied us that any attempt of that kind was hopeless. He declared with an oath, and in an angry manner, that he would not sell her for *any* price. We endeavored to work upon his feelings, by representing to him the distress he would inflict upon her husband and innocent children; and we finally offered him four hundred dollars for her manumission, which at the time was a very high price. But he continued inexorable, and treated us with the utmost contempt.—The magistrate though stupified with wine, (which was commonly the case with him after dinner,) seemed moved with compassion. He asked the woman if she were a slave. I objected to her answering the question, unless he would agree to receive all she might say as evidence. This he declined. I then observed to him that he must be aware that the most honest were liable to be mistaken as to the identity of persons; and it was matter of surprise to me that the witnesses should be so positive in this case; especially as the woman was but sixteen when they said she eloped, and such long time had since elapsed. That her case was nothing less in importance to her, her husband, and children, than death itself; that for my own part I was not satisfied, by any means; for I conscientiously believed the woman had a *just* claim (of the *legal* claim I said nothing) to her freedom. She stood before the magistrate, holding a little girl and boy by the hand. Her manners were calm and dignified; if she had been educated a lady, they could not have been more so. The children were too young to be fully sensible of the horrible doom that seemed to await their mother; and yet they were old enough to discover that their parents were in trouble; and the tears ran freely down the cheeks of those innocents. I have said the mother was handsome; and she was really so. But on this occasion, the anguish of her heart was plainly written on her countenance. I never shall forget the scene I witnessed that day; it is as fresh before me as though it occurred but yesterday.

At length, a plan was suggested to my mind, that I thought might possibly prove successful; and it appeared to be the only alternative. I proposed that the case should be adjourned till the next day; that we might have further opportunity to inquire into it. I suggested that Thomas Harrison and myself would become security to the United States, in any reasonable sum that might be demanded, for her appearance. The claimant was a stupid looking fellow; and being sure of his game, he made no objection. The case was accordingly postponed. I now began to think I had succeeded; and taking a copy of the recognizance from the docket, signed by the magistrate, I withdrew. The recognizance was to this effect: Thomas Harrison and myself were bound to the United States, in the sum of one thousand dollars, to produce the woman at his office, the next morning, at nine o'clock. Thomas Harrison was quite a humorous character, and had a common saying, when any thing was omitted or imperfect, "There is a hole in the ballad." Upon leaving the office, I said to him, "Dost thou see a hole in the ballad?" He replied, "No." "The recognizance we have just signed is good for nothing," said I; "for the United States have no claim upon the woman."

The next morning, at nine o'clock, we were at the magistrate's office. The claimant and his witnesses were also present; but the woman did not come; the reader can guess whether or not I expected her. After waiting about an hour, the magistrate, said to Thomas Harrison and myself, "Well, gentlemen, I shall be obliged to forfeit your recognizance, as the woman does not appear." I replied, "A thousand dollars is a great deal of money; but if the worst comes to the worst, we must pay to the United States, all the demand they have against her." "United States!" exclaimed the Alderman, and turned to look at his docket. After a pause of perhaps a minute, he said to the claimant, "Mr.———, There is difficulty here; you had better employ counsel." The man replied, that he was a stranger, and did not know who to apply to. The alderman referred him to Thomas Ross, a respectable lawyer, who lived a few doors above. The claimant went for him, and in a few minutes he made his appearance at the office. He asked what was the matter. The magistrate informed him that the gentleman had arrested his slave, and made proof of his property; but as I had wished for further time, and had offered to enter into recognizance to the United States for her appearance, he had inadvertently entered it in that manner on his docket. T. Ross examined the entry, and turning to me, with a look and gesture of comical significance, exclaimed, "Eh!" To the claimant he said, "You must catch your slave again; you can do nothing with the securities."—The alderman, who was now sober, saw that he had been misled. Both he and the claimant were much exasperated; they charged me with playing a trick upon them, and threatened me with prosecution. But I had no fears on that score. I told them that if I had designedly done all they charged me with, I thought even that was better than that the woman should be torn from the arms of her husband and helpless children.

The magistrate asked me how I could say that I believed she had a *just* claim to her freedom, as I had produced no evidence to prove it? I replied that I believed every human being had a *just* claim to freedom, unless he had committed some crime whereby he had forfeited it; and that slavery was founded in the most gross injustice and cruelty. The claimant observed that the laws of the land sanctioned it; and I had no right to fly in the face of the law. I told him if I had broken any law, I was willing to meet the consequences; but no law could make wrong right. The Jews said *they* had a law, and by it Christ ought to die; but that did not justify them in murdering him.

I am aware that some will disapprove of the part I acted in this case, as being inconsistent with the candor which men ought to practise on all occasions toward each other. I can only answer that I never felt condemned in my own heart for it. I could devise no other means to save the poor victim. The claimant spent several days in fruitless search for the fugitive. After giving up all hope of finding her, he called upon me, and offered to manumit her for four hundred dollars. I told him we would at one time freely have given him that sum; but now the circumstances of the case were greatly changed; and we would not give him half that amount. After much bickering, he finally consented to take one hundred and fifty. It was paid, and a manumission duly executed.—When the claimant, (I have forgotten his name,) was about leaving my house, he stopped at the front door, and turning toward me, with a most malicious grin, said, "I hope I may live till I see you south of the Potomac!" I replied, "Thou hadst better go home and repent of the sins already hanging over thy head, instead of meditating the commission of more." I never saw him afterwards.

The Anti-Slavery Standard.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 28, 1842.

OUR ANGLO SAXON ANCESTRY.

In the progress of language, it often happens that phrases come to be used in a manner absurdly contrary to their original meaning; and historical facts, in process of time, are twisted into the strangest perversions of truth, and so imbedded in the popular mind that it is impossible to eradicate them.

No boast is more common in the mouths of our boastful countrymen, than their Anglo Saxon ancestry. The southerner thinks he has uttered an unanswerable argument in favor of his "peculiar institution," when he asserts that the Anglo Saxon has ever evinced a spirit of liberty too high and haughty to submit to bondage for a single year; while Africa has tamely yielded to it for centuries. Fourth-of-July orators heap up glittering metaphors, to illustrate the never-yielding energy of the Anglo Saxon race; and politicians urge the conquest and plunder of Mexico, that the strong, never-bending Anglo Saxon may possess that glorious region of sunshine and gold. Loud and long are the boasts, that tyranny could never bow the proud spirit of the Anglo Saxon into tame submission! and therefore the world is his oyster, which he forsooth is to open with the point of his sword!

The plain, unvarnished truth is, our Anglo Saxon ancestry were slaves. Out of two millions of people, fifteen hundred thousand were goods and chattels, to all intents and purposes. They were bought and sold with the soil they tilled; and in legal conveyances they were enumerated promiscuously with cattle and other property. In our southern papers it is an every day affair to see advertisements of "men and women, oxen and hogs, with sundry old candle-boxes." And in the history of their revered ancestors, from whom they derive their divine right to enslave, we find property on an estate enumerated thus: "A hundred sheep, fifty-five swine, two men, and five yoked oxen." These men, be it observed, were pure Anglo Saxons, held by Norman conquerors, as their "peculiar species of property."

In the year 1381, *all* cultivators of the soil in England were serfs, in body and goods. They were compelled to toil, without other compensation than such food and clothing as their masters saw fit to grant. Their lords could sell them, at any time, with their horses, oxen, implements of husbandry, children and posterity. English deeds of that period were thus expressed: "Know that I have sold Ethelred, my knave, and all his offspring born, or to be born." The *standard* by which the value of a man was then estimated is not without significant reference to our own customs. "At every purchase and sale, money was paid to the gerefa; for an ox, a farthing was allowed; for a man, four pennies."

Thierry tells us, in his admirable History of the Norman Conquest, that Danish and Norman pirates made themselves masters of many towns and villages in Gaul; but the castles, palaces, and rich abbeys were fortified by cavaliers. Villages were burnt, and men and women were dragged into slavery by the Normans, within bow-shot of the cavaliers. The kings of Gaul deemed it for their safety to sacrifice the rights of the weak to the interests of the strong; they therefore entered into treaties with the robbers, in which they engaged, "on their souls' salvation, *to bring back to them such of their slaves as had escaped*; and to raise for them the *war tax* on the villains, clowns, and husbandmen."

Our slaves were procured after precisely the same fashion; only from Africa, instead of Gaul. The pledge to send back such slaves as escaped, will remind the intelligent reader of our own "glorious Union;" only, as the framers of our Constitution lived in an age of improved diplomacy, Part III. Sec. 2. Article iv. is worded with a more careful regard to appearance. As for the "war tax," Giddings's Florida speech is a sufficient commentary thereon; nor will other and startling commentaries be wanting.

Thierry informs us, that "After the Saxons had conquered the Danes, and oppressed them with laws necessary to keep down a subjugated people, *they began to lose some of their own liberties*, and to *feel* something of the galling chain they had placed upon the conquered. For as the same kings exercised power in the North, where lived the Anglo Danes, and the South, where lived Anglo Saxons, they were soon led to confound the two characters, and make little distinction between them."

In connection with this, does any one need to be reminded of the gag rule in Congress? Of the imprisonment and sale of free northern sailors in our southern ports? Of lynchings of northern citizens, if they dare to use more freedom of speech than is granted to the slave? Of the Supreme Court of the land deciding that children born in the free North may be siezed and carried into southern slavery, without judge or jury? Oh, wise and unchangeable is the law, that "they who take captive shall be carried into captivity!" Of a truth, "men always *take* that which they *give*."

The priesthood of that day bore a wonderful resemblance to the same reverend order in our own times. We are told that "the primate Lanfranc devoted himself to the cause of the Normans, heart and soul. He first grew rich by sharing their plunder of the Saxons, and afterward by selling to the Normans pardon for their tyrannies, thefts, cruelties and debaucheries." Whether they defended their position by reference to Abraham and the patriarchs, we are not informed; but doubtless, proofs that slavery was a "divine institution" were not wanting upon emergency. We are not told what use they made of the "Curse upon Canaan;" but of course learned monks would have no difficulty in making out a very clear and satisfactory genealogy from Canaan directly down to the Anglo Saxons. They had no Board of Foreign Missions, in those days; but there were not wanting, even then, pious individuals, who gave Saxon babies to the church, by donation or legacy. Thus one rich man, for the peace of his soul, bequeathed to "Ælfere the Abbot, the land at Ferseeford, with the provisions and men thereon;" and a wealthy widow gives to her priest, "Ælfsige the cook; and Telf, the daughter of Wareburga; and Ecelm, his wife, and their child." Of these, the names are sufficient warrant that they were of the glorious Anglo Saxon race. The clergy of those days not only received the price of blood, but they themselves traded in it, as coolly as the Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists, &c. of the present time. Thus history tells us of a pious abbot, who "sold Wargmic, the Saxon, for an yre of gold."

The Normans had *their* "patrol system." The Anglo Saxon slave hastened to hide himself within the enclosure of his own hut, as soon as the curfew bell had sounded; for well "the base hound" knew that chains awaited him for the night, and an oaken staff for his shoulders in the morning. Thus the colored man, bond or free, at the South, fears to venture abroad to call a physician in the night-time, even if his wife be dying; for he is well aware that the cage, the chain, and the lash are the penalty he incurs.

History informs us, that "two hundred years after the Norman Conquest, when some of the descendants of Saxons in cities began to grow rich by their industry, if they attempted to hold a horse-race, or a tourney, the Norman lords, would send lacqueys and esquires to annoy them, by shouting in their ears that exercises in arms were not befitting soap-boilers and flour sellers, like them." In a similar spirit, a wealthy colored man was mobbed in one of our southern cities, for presuming to ride in his own carriage; and for a negro to aspire to a college education would be considered a most alarming piece of impudence, worthy of "thirty-nine lashes well laid on."

The usurping Norman claimed a right to every species of property that had been held by the Saxon he displaced. But if *another* Norman, by mistake or treachery, came into possession of any part of it, there forthwith arose lawsuits and duels. A similar case is now in controversy between two of our southern States. A citizen of Mississippi has been accused of stealing a negro and carrying him into North Carolina. Governor McNut has demanded the stolen property of Governor Morehead; and because he refuses to deliver up, his conduct receives the severest official censure.

The Normans, when a brother marauder took away property which belonged to neither, made a great hallooballoo about "unjust invasion," "seizure," "unjust pretensions," &c. The Norman roll abounds with such phrases. Doubtless there is something comic in this attestation of the idea of abstract justice in the registered robbery of a whole nation; but our southern brethren fall into precisely the same vein, when they strive, by legal enactments, or otherwise, to express their indignation against kidnapping.

The Normans had cant phrases to give their wholesale robbery a gentlemanly sound. In their lawsuits, records, &c. they never said "The castle of which I *robbed* Ediwic the Saxon;" but always, "My *inheritance* from Ediwic the Saxon." In alluding to the man whose estates, wife, and children, he had stolen, the polished Norman always called him "My *predecessor* on the aforesaid estates." According to their convenient vocabulary, a *just* man signified one who made it a point of honor not to rob *another Norman*; it had no reference whatever to the rights, or property, of "base Saxon churls." We can more than match them in smooth phrases to hide a foul enormity. Our Constitution makes no mention of *slaves*, they are "persons held to labor." Then behold the uncouth phrase stretched every way to cover what might appear unseemly if it peeped out at the corners! "Excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all *other persons*."

The love of liberty, though it could not create Saxon armies, under circumstances of such overwhelming tyranny, did create bands of partisans, brigands of the forest or the mountain, who gained precarious subsistence by robbing the harvests that were rightfully their own; of all such the Normans made example on the gibbet, whenever they came within their power. Such brigands abound in southern swamps; and their existence compels masters to keep trained blood-hounds in readiness for the "Negro hunt." Everybody has heard of Robin Hood and his brave followers; living in thick forests, sleeping on their arms, and bidding defiance to Norman chivalry. Saxon serfs dared not speak the name of Robin Hood before their lordly masters; but in the secresy of their own huts, they sung songs in praise of the hero, and listened with eager interest to every whispered tale of his wild exploits. When one of his troop died on the gibbet, they dared not mourn openly, but deep, deep in Saxon hearts was he a consecrated martyr. And thus, even now, were you to visit Virginia huts, in the silence of midnight, you might hear the old colored inhabitants talk, in whispers scarcely above their breath, of the great "prophet, Nat Turner;" and snatches of free songs, too, you might hear; one line of which, if sung abroad in open daylight, would call whole counties to arms. There, as among the Saxons of old, the smothered love of liberty shows itself in the manner of hating those whom they have the will to conquer, without the power; of loving those who contend with their oppressors; and of sympathizing with those who elude their vigilance.

Throughout the broad green forests of ancient Britain, was there a Saxon serf who would refuse food to the brave Robin Hood? And who can count the stealthy midnight visits to southern cabins, from hidden outlaws in the caves and swamps?

I have heard the celebrated John Pierpont tell the strong impression made on his imagination by one of this class, whom he saw in South Carolina, when he was employed there as a teacher, in his early days.—When the fugitive was brought in, he was clothed in an entire suit of moss, which he had manufactured for himself; and a strangely picturesque appearance he made in his Crusoe costume! The moss was of that kind which hangs in abundant tow-wreaths from southern forests, and is imported in large quantities for matresses. Chateaubriand describes its appearance, with poetic beauty, in his Atala; and Pierpont, in his scorching lines called The Gaz, represents the unbending firs thus addressing Atherton, of New Hampshire:

> "Go! hide thee in the cypress swamps
> That darken o'er the black Santee—
> And be the moss above thy head,
> The gloomy drapery of thy bed!
> The moss, that creeps from bough to bough,
> And hangs in many a dull festoon;
> There, peeping through thy curtain, thou
> Mayest catch some glimpses of the moon;
> Or, better, twist of it a string,
> Noose in thy neck, repent, and ——swing."

Of this moss the outlaw had twisted strands, which he sewed together with the same material, by the help of thorns; and with ready ingenuity had fashioned it into jacket, trowsers, and a cap like a bee hive. His excursions were limited to a narrow strip of land, about thirty miles long, bounded on either side by rivers; party after party had been sent in pursuit of him; yet for eighteen months he contrived to elude the utmost vigilance of his pursuers, and lived in forest freedom. Surely, the brave indomitable spirit of Robin Hood was there!

The old Normans, when they purchased Saxon slaves, were wont to close the bill of sale thus: "May he have God's curse forever, that ever this undoes. Amen." *They* could invoke the Divine sanction on such deeds, as well as the American clergy. See a sermon of the Rev. T. Clapp, of New Orleans, where he quotes the Old Testament, and exclaims, with religious fervor, "Here we see God dealing in slaves."

In another respect, the Norman chivalry was like that of the modern. The Saxon women, of all classes and conditions, were compelled, willing or unwilling, to submit entirely to their master's orders; and they were, "like our Patriarchs, blest,

> (So say some eloquent divines)
> With God-given slaves and concubines."

I might go on still farther, instituting comparisons between the past and the present; but enough has been said to show the absurd boast of an Anglo Saxon ancestry that never bowed their heads to the yoke. Our very language reveals the fact that our Saxon ancestors were slaves. They were swine-herds, and cow-herds, tending the animals, whose flesh they were never allowed to eat. When ready for the table, it was reserved for the lordly Norman, from whose foreign language it took its name. Thus swine is Saxon, and pork Norman, (*porc*;) ox is Saxon, and beef Norman, (*beuf*;) calf is Saxon, and veal Norman, (*veau*.) The thoughts to which this inequality of condition gave rise, comprise the whole of modern anti-slavery doctrine; and in the record oppressors may see both prophesy and warning. When called upon to fight the French, (in Richard II's time,) the serfs said, "We are the servants of these chevaliers; the animals which they fleece. If England were to be lost, we should lose much less than they."—These remarks, as they walked home from their work, were soon succeeded by graver speeches

sprung from the same parents, Adam and Eve? They are clad in velvet, crimson, and furs, and have spices and good wines. We have the refuse of the straw, and water to drink. They have repose, and the fine manors. We have pain and toil, wind and rain, in the fields." Upon which, the meeting would tumultuously exclaim, "We will no longer be like the beasts! If we work for the lords, we must be paid for it."

Thierry's book pleased me exceedingly. It aims to be the history of a *people*, not of a few battles. It is written with a beautiful simplicity of style, and for the first time presented to me the *Saxon* side of the story. His characters, too, notwithstanding the scantiness of his materials, seem to have an individual life, very refreshing to one weary of Gibbon's masses of men, with waving plumes, forever stalking in theatrical procession across the crowded stage. Edith, called the "swan-necked," who was sent for to distinguish her lover, King Harold, among the mangled heaps of the slain, on the fatal field of Hastings, though spoken of but in two brief sentences, has walked in my imagination ever since. With what a mournful and mysterious grace her fair shadow flits across that dimly visible segment of far-distant time! So ghost-like, yet so human! And this is all we know of thee, thou beautiful and beloved of princes! All thy heart's fond hopes; its proud aspirations; its bitter tears; thy temptings of Satan in the wilderness; thy yearnings to approach the Infinite, revealed to thee in glimpses of bright spirits, whose transfigured faces shone on thee from sacred mounts; all, all the stern struggles, which every human soul must encounter in its mysterious pilgrimage from the unknown whence to the unknown whither—all these are unrecorded here, though painted in the galleries above. We only see thee, without sigh, or tear, bending in "voiceless wo" over the desolation of thy own and thy country's hopes, on that frightful battle-field. We only guess that thou, too, became the conqueror's slave.—L. M. C.

ISAAC T. HOPPER, J. S. GIBBONS, AND CHARLES MARRIOTT.

The proceedings of Friends in New-York, with regard to these individuals, have excited a deep interest in the society, and therefore it is incumbent on us to inform Friends at a distance of the progress of those cases. Our readers are already aware that they appealed to the Quarterly meeting at Westbury, and that the disownment of I. T. Hopper, and J. S. Gibbons, was confirmed. A like decision took place in Charles Marriott's case, at the Quarterly meeting held in Westbury, on the 21st instant. The charge was as follows: "Information has been received from the Southern District Preparative Meeting, that Charles Marriott is engaged in the support and publication of a paper, which tends to excite disunity and discord among us." No other charge of any name or nature was preferred. The paper alluded to is the Anti-Slavery Standard.

History teaches the bitterness and despotism of ecclesiastical persecution; and those who know human nature, will not expect its spirit to be essentially different in the nineteenth century from what it was in the sixteenth.—But those who have taken a deep interest in the early history of the Society of Friends, and regarded its principles as identical with primitive Christianity, and of course distinguished for mildness and toleration, will be both surprised and grieved at the proceeding. Those who know the society only by its professed principles, and are, at the same time, acquainted with Charles Marriott, will indeed marvel! A man whose gentleness might disarm an enraged inquisitor; whose very heart-strings are bound to all the principles and testimonies of the society that thus seeks to excommunicate one of its most esteemed and influential members. It is a transaction that needs no comment. It will produce its own results, unaided by us. The very largely increased number of our subscribers among the Society of Friends already gives indication of this. All we ask of them is, that each one will candidly judge for himself concerning the spirit and character of this paper.

The appeals of Isaac T. Hopper, and James S. Gibbons, are going to the Yearly meeting, which is to be held next month. The Quarterly meeting was informed, by its clerk, that it was the wish of Charles Marriott that *his* appeal should go up at the same time; and that he was in waiting to furnish them officially with that information, if required. Many Friends thought this request ought to be granted; others, *those from New-York, particularly, rose almost in a body against it;* and it was refused. Thus this case is not to reach the Yearly meeting, until 5th month, 1843. It is said this will give him time to reflect. He has already had one year for that purpose; and surely that might be deemed sufficient for a man of ordinary calmness and sobriety. Many honest minds will ask whether a *delay* of justice is not, under some circumstances, a practical *denial* of it. Persecution is proverbially blind to the effects of its own acts. Our 500 subscribers among Friends, have already grown to 1000; and these proceedings will add to our list. Nevertheless, we in all sincerity regret them. We would far rather see the Society of Friends a burning and a shining light, as it was in the olden time.

MADISON WASHINGTON.

The Friend of Man contains some new and highly interesting particulars concerning this celebrated hero of the Creole:

"About eighteen months since, Madison was in Canada. He there bore this name. He staid a while in the family of Hiram Wilson, who describes him, like the Creole protest," as a very *large* and *strong* slave. Madison had been some time in Canada—long enough to love and rejoice in British liberty. But he loved his wife who was left a slave in Virginia still more. At length Madison resolved on rescuing her from slavery. Although strongly dissuaded by his friends from making the attempt in person, he would not listen, but crossed the line into this State. At Rochester, he fell in with friend Lindley Murray Moore, who collected ten dollars to aid him in his journey towards Virginia. So strong was Madison's determination, that at this time he assured his friends he would have his wife or lose his life.

"As he passed along, he was heard from at Utica and in Albany. The next account, he stands a freeman on the deck of the Creole—the master-spirit of the noble nineteen!"

The probability is, that Madison lost his own liberty, in trying to secure that of his wife; and was sold into the far South, according to slaveholding custom on such occasions. Whether his wife was sold with him is unknown. We would give much to learn whether she was on board the Creole. It would be curious indeed, if this little sub-plot of domestic love should set in motion a great game of nations, with England and the United States for actors.

LAW OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

At the last session of the legislature an act was passed, "to prevent the citizens of New-York from carrying slaves, or persons held to service, out of the State, and to prevent the escape of persons charged with the commission of any crime."

This law is to take effect on the 1st of May next; unless New-York repeals her law of 1840, granting the right of trial by jury to fugitive slaves. This act declares that no vessel of any size or description, owned in whole or in part, commanded or navigated, by any other person than an actual inhabitant of South Carolina, and destined to any port in the State of New-York, shall be allowed to depart, until inspected by the proper officer. If any vessel depart without a certificate that no slave-criminal is on board, the captain or owner shall pay five-hundred dollars to whoever will sue for the same. The inspector is to receive ten dollars for his certificate, for the payment of which the vessel is liable.

Whenever any vessel of the above description enters the ports of South Carolina, the inspector is to take possession of her until the master or owner executes a bond, in the penalty of one thousand dollars, or deliver up to the inspector the vessel's papers, with an affidavit that he will not sail till the vessel has undergone inspection according to law. If these terms are not complied with, an officer remains on board, at three dollars a day, for which the vessel is liable. The regular packets between New-York and Charleston are required to give but one bond a year.

If any slave, or criminal, is found on board, the captain or owner forfeits five hundred dollars, or the value of the slave, and all costs.

How much trouble these people might save themselves, if they would!

CHANNING'S PAMPHLET ON THE CREOLE CASE.—The Pennsylvania Freeman has published this admirable work entire. Copies are for sale at our office; price 5 cents.

☞ The Acknowledgments are unavoidably crowded out this week.

Congressional.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, April 13.

Mr. Wise, of Va. rose, as he said, to make "a very calm and dispassionate reply" to Mr. Slade. He said the tyrant of Mexico was now at war with Texas, and had threatened that he would invade her territory, and "never stop till he had driven slavery beyond the Sabine;" and the gentleman would let him let loose his servile horde on the citizens of Louisiana, yet send no minister to remonstrate or to threaten him.

Mr. Slade explained that he did not object to the mission, but to the individual sent.

Mr. Wise resumed, and repeated what he had before said, as to the possibility that the Mexican arms might drive back the slaves of Texas beyond the Sabine, upon Louisiana and Arkansas. The English papers openly advanced the doctrine, that it was the aim and policy of Great Britain to make what she was pleased to denominate *the insolvent nations*, pay their debts to her by the cession of territory. Thus Spain must surrender Cuba, and Mexico must surrender Texas and California. He referred to the British command of the Gulf of Mexico, and the possibility of her rendering that sea a *mare clausum* to the people of the valley of the Mississippi. And it was a part of the same policy that she should keep increasing the debt of Mexico, by affording to her the means of invading Texas and the United States, and thus ultimately force her to give up California. The gentleman from Vermont had stated that it was the design of the President to accomplish the annexation of Texas, if possible. His assertion, unsubstantiated by proof, must go for nothing. He earnestly hoped the President might be as anxious for it as he was represented to be. He quoted a letter, dated March, 1825, from Mr. Clay, then Secretary of State, to Mr. Poinsett, then minister to Mexico, showing that J. Q. Adams, then President, considered the annexation of Texas so important, that he had offered a million of dollars for the territory, if it extended to the Rio del Norte. He (Mr. W.) had applauded that line of policy then, and if such was now Mr. Tyler's policy, he applauded it still. There was now no money to be paid for the territory; it was occupied by a sovereign power, which had authority to transfer it. And why should not Texas be transferred to this Union? What would the effect of such an event be? To extend slavery? Slavery existed in Texas to just the same extent now, as it would were Texas a part of the United States. The only difference would be, to bring it under our own jurisdiction. It was now in a foreign State, where we could exert no influence over it, to mitigate its severity or restrain its abuse. Was it in the spirit of philanthropy that gentlemen opposed it? In the spirit of Christian missionaries? Mr. W. thought it was held among them that to benefit the heathen you must be among them.—Christianity must be brought to bear upon their minds; and so, if these philanthropic gentlemen wanted to mitigate those evils of slavery, over which they made such doleful lamentations, let them bring it within our reach and jurisdiction.

Could they multiply their petitions ten thousand fold, would they reach slavery in a foreign State? If the spirit of emancipation was to go forth, like an angel, from the North toward the South, striking off manacles and dying up tears, (Mr. W. now spoke as one of themselves,) why not bring the slavery of Texas also within its range? Why leave that one dark spot untouched? Did they not perceive that, as long as Texas remained in a separate State, it would be an asylum for slavery? Drive it south, as they might, here the slaveholder could set them at defiance; for, once beyond the Texan boundary line, their jurisdiction was at an end. Yet they were banded together, as one man, to oppose the annexation. Could anything more strikingly show the blindness of fanaticism?

But possibly they would evade the force of this argument by looking to England to emancipate the slaves of Texas; if so, they utterly mistook the motives and the means of England. She had in the republic of Texas a rival to the United States, in the production of cotton; and as long as she wished to retain her as such, she would keep up the slave labor in Texas against the slave labor in the United States. Mr. W. scouted the idea of England being sincerely engaged in the work of emancipation; he referred to the late detection of a conspiracy between British cruisers on the coast of Africa and the slave dealers, and also to her undeviating course of oppression in India, as proofs to the contrary. If gentlemen wished to keep Texas as a foreign State, in juxtaposition with our southwestern border, that she might be a mart for contraband dealers in cotton, for the benefit of England, and to the injury of the southern States—if that was their object—then it was the surest way that could be taken to rivet upon her the chains of slavery forever. No: if they were really sincere in their professed desires to see slavery abolished, their true and only course was to annex Texas to the United States.—[A laugh in certain portions of the House.] He laughed to scorn all efforts to prevent the great valley of the West from emigrating to join the armies of Texas.—They had gone once already; it was they that conquered Santa Anna at San Jacinto; and three-fourths of them, after winning that glorious field, had peaceably returned to their homes. But once set before them the conquest of the rich Mexican provinces, and you might as well attempt to stop the wind. This government might send its troops to the frontier to turn them back, and they would run over them like a herd of buffalo.—Let the work once begin, and Mr. W. did not know that this House would hold *him* very long. Let Texas give him but five millions of dollars, and he would undertake to pay every American claimant against Mexico four fold his demand. He would fix our boundary, not where Mr. Adams had tried to fix it, at the Rio del Norte, but far, far beyond; ay, and he would soon fix California where all the power of Great Britain should never be able to reach it. Slavery should pour itself abroad without restraint, and find no limit but the Southern ocean. The Comanches should no longer hold the richest mines of Mexico; but every golden image, now worshipped in defiance of the commands of God, should soon be melted down, not into Spanish milled dollars, indeed, but into good American eagles. [Laughter, mixed with some exclamations.] Yes; then should more hard money flow into the United States than any exchequer or sub-treasury could ever circulate. He would cause as much gold to cross the Rio del Norte as the mules of Mexico could carry; ay, and make a better use of it, too, than any lazy, bigoted priesthood under heaven. [A general laugh] Nothing could keep these booted loafers from rushing on till they kicked the Spanish priests out of the temples they profaned.

Mr. W. went into a calculation to show that it would be impossible for Mexico to resist the force of Texas when recruited from the western States.

He wanted no war with Mexico; he went for sending a minister to preserve peace; but, unless she treated our citizens on an equal footing with those of England, he was for war, and cared not how soon. Of the treatment of the Santa Fé prisoners, he spoke with fiery indignation.

It was said that this would marry us to a war with England. This had been too well answered by his friend (Mr. Cushing) already; but for his own part, if he was to choose a war with any power, the prospect of a war with England was the very thing he should desire. If he were to pick out a war to suit his taste, it would be a war with England. Here was a "foeman worthy of our steel." He would leave Mexico to Texas and the people of the valley; they could soon dispose of her. Let a war come with France, the United States, and Texas on the one side, and England and Mexico on the other; he would ask nothing better.

Mr. W. proceeded to insist that a majority of the people of the United States were in favor of the annexation; at all events, he would risk it with the democracy of the North. He would ask the men of Maine and New Hampshire, and the whalers of Nantucket, whether they were willing that England should get possession of California? He would risk all the blue lights. Our policy was peace, but our people were warlike; and to threaten them with the growl of the British lion, was the very way to rouse the American eagle from her eyry, cause her to plume her wings, and take her soaring flight to the ramparts of Mexico, and there demand a compliance with all our just demands. Nor would Mr. W. stop there; he would demand the non-invasion of Texas; he would say to Mexico, "If you strike Texas, you strike us;" and if England, standing by, should dare to intermeddle, and ask, "Do you take part with Texas?" his prompt answer should be, "Yes, and against you."

Such, he would let gentlemen know, was the spirit of the whole people of the great valley of the West.

One of the best effects of this state of things would be to cause the abolition party, to which these gentlemen belonged, to hide their diminished heads. Yes; it would very quickly subject them to the law of tar and feathers. Let them utter such sentiments as they now poured forth so freely, when the country was once in an actual state of war, and they would meet the fate which their friends met in the last war. They were burnt children, and they never would venture to oppose another war; if they did, they were doomed men.

He adverted to the growth of the worship of mammon throughout our country in these piping times of peace, and said that, if the crystal waters of peace proved insufficient to cleanse us from the accumulated corruption, he would let the bloody streams of war perform the work. It would sweep off drones and loafers, and men of broken fortunes and broken reputation, many of whom would hail the first blast of the trumpet as the renovating note of their emancipation. War was a curse, but it had its blessings, too; as the destroying lightning of heaven purified the atmosphere. He would vote for this mission as the means of peace; but if it must lead to war, then he would vote for it the more willingly.

APRIL 14.

The appropriation bill again came up, on the pending motion of Mr. Linn, concerning the mission to Mexico. Wise, of Va. and Butler of S. C. spoke in defense of Waddy Thompson, in reply to Mr. Slade's remarks; in the course of which Mr. Butler said:

This was the time when a representative of this country should be at Mexico to watch the course of events, and report them truly and faithfully. At this time, when this petty tyrant was marching to invade Texas, aided by British gold and British influence, the proposition was to withdraw our minister! Whatever might be the sympathies of a certain class of gentlemen, here and elsewhere, whether they might or might not be enlisted on the side of the tyrant of Mexico, *his* feelings were enlisted in behalf of that gallant people of Texas, who, by their sufferings, their hardships, and their bravery, had entitled themselves to the consideration of the civilized world.

With respect to the invasion by the Mexicans and the subjugation of Texas, the greater probability was that Texas, with her single star, would march to Mexico itself; and he hoped the time was not far distant when they might hear the pleasing intelligence that that single star, the emblem of liberty, is flying in triumph over Mexico.

The gentleman from Vermont was not a man easily excited; but when bent on this object of mischief, when engaged on this subject, which appeared uppermost in his feelings, he would indulge in intemperance and violence towards that portion of the country, which he appeared to hate with a holy hatred. What might have been the relationship of that gentleman with the present minister to Mexico he did not know.—The gentleman had taken occasion in his absence to say that, from his want of temper, he was unfit to represent us at Mexico. If the gentleman had received from this officer a private injury, it would have been much more becoming in him to have repelled the insult at the time, than at this distant period.

Mr. Slade quietly replied that he had no recollection of ever having received any personal insult from General Thompson.

Ingersoll, of Pa. made a speech, in the course of which he praised Mr. Stevenson's letter, and General Cass's pamphlet; and amid reiterated professions of peace, talked in a very belligerent strain toward Great Britain. J. Q. Adams replied to this in a vein of irony, that kept the house convulsed with roars of laughter. He then went on to answer Mr. Wise: The gentleman from Virginia does not immediately connect the questions of war with Mexico and war with Great Britain; but he apparently knows and feels that they are in substance one and the same question. So surely as we rush into a war with Mexico, we shall shortly find ourselves in a war with England. On that subject, I will venture to say the minister from England has no instructions. I think the gentleman from Virginia rested the question of war with Mexico on three grounds: 1st, that our citizens had claims against the Mexican government, to the amount of ten or twelve millions; 2d, that some ten or twelve of our citizens had been treated with great severity by the Mexican government, being compelled to work at cleaning the streets; that these citizens were detained in servitude, while one British subject had been promptly released on the first demand of the British minister; 3d, that a war with Mexico would accomplish the annexation of Texas to the Union. The gentleman was in favor of war, not merely for the abstract purpose of annexing Texas to the Union, but he was for war by peremptorily prohibiting Santa Anna from invading Texas. I will take up these reasons in order. I am not willing to go to war for the recovery of the ten or twelve millions of dollars due us by Mexico. I think it not justifiable to do so; and, if I am in favor of retaining a full minister at that court, it is precisely for the reason that I am for conducting a pacific negotiation for that debt, and not for going to war to recover it. I am therefore for a pacific mission to Mexico. I am for staving off as long as possible the final right of the government of the United States to assume a threatening tone in order to recover this debt. That time, I think, has not arrived. When it shall arrive, there will be no occasion for a special mission, but for raising money, a thousand fold more than the whole amount of the debt, in order to obtain right and justice. Going to war with Mexico, even though it should present to us the tempting advantage of robbing churches and priests, would not be my mode for recovering our debt. I do not think it the proper remedy; and that is one of the reasons why I am for retaining the full mission.

There is a second reason given by the gentleman from Virginia in favor of war. He reminds us, with great warmth, that there are some ten or twelve citizens of the United States now prisoners in the city of Mexico, and dragging chains about the streets of that city; that a British subject taken with them has been liberated while they are kept in bondage. Now, if I am correctly informed, one American citizen, a son of General Coombs, has been liberated on the application of the minister of the United States, who was as fairly a subject of imprisonment as the British subject, of whom the gentleman speaks. I certainly have no objection to our minister's making such representations as he can in favor of the release of citizens of the United States, although taken in actual war against Mexico, *in association with* Texan forces; but I am not prepared to go to war to obtain their liberation. I must first be permitted to ask, *how is it that these men happen to be in the streets of Mexico.*—Is it not because they formed part of an expedition got up in Texas against the Mexican city of Santa Fe? Were they not taken *flagrante bello*, actually engaged in a war which they had nothing to do with, to which the United States were no party? In all this great pity and sympathy for American citizens, made to travel hundreds of miles barefoot and in chains, the question "how *came* they there?" seems never to be asked. And yet, so far as the interposition of this nation for their recovery is concerned, that is the very first question to be asked. It was a regular warlike expedition, got up by the President of the republic of Texas for conquest within the Mexican territories; the object being, no doubt, to secure to Texas the possession of the sources of the Rio del Norte; for Santa Fe is situated at the source of that river.—The State of Texas has never explicitly declared her boundaries, so that they are not exactly known; but, whatever they are, they are no bounds to them; for President Houston has declared that he means to transcend them, and to push on into Mexico; and the gentleman from Virginia tells us that if Houston does not do it, he himself, is ready to go and plant his standard on the lofty summit of that city. [A laugh.]

Well, sir, this same President of Texas has done another thing. I do not know whether it is likely to bring us into difficulty with him; for really the symptoms among us are such, that it seems he will be allowed to do anything. Now, a blockade must have the effect of cutting off our trade with those ports. Not a vessel of the United States can approach the port of Vera Cruz, but she will be stopped and turned back, to the total derangement of her voyage and the probable ruin of her owner, and that, under this paper blockade. The two States are at war; and the most recent act of hostility is this expedition against Santa Fé with a view to conquer and attach it to the territory of Texas. From our own valley of the Mississippi, on whose valiant and enterprising sons the gentleman from Virginia pronounced so high a panegyric, and whose high-souled patriotism is so strongly stimulated by the prospect of robbing priests and pillaging churches, [a laugh,] ten or twelve persons, in the ardor of their disinterested zeal for liberty, joined this Texan expedition against a part of the dominions of Mexico; but fortune did not smile upon the enterprise.—I have heard of no very valiant exploits achieved by their arms; but, on the contrary, the moment they came in actual contact with the Mexican authorities, weak as they are, they laid down their arms and became prisoners of war at discretion. They were treated as Mexico treats her prisoners of war. I do not undertake to justify that course of treatment; but I will say, that if our minister to Mexico has received instructions imperatively to demand their release, and, if that shall be refused, to come immediately home, what will be the consequences? I hope the consequences will be to save to the Treasury a little of his salary as minister: any other consequence than this I earnestly deprecate. If, however, he does come back, I confess I shall not regret it; for, even after the high eulogium bestowed upon his character and qualifications by the gentleman from Virginia, if my opinon were asked, I should still say that I prefer that some other individual should occupy the post. I say nothing in opposition to the eloquent panegyric pronounced upon the individual: my reasons are, that, upon the questions in controversy between Mexico and this country, I know that his views are such as will not be very likely to perpetuate a state of peace between the two countries, or very advantageous to the union of these States, as now constituted. On a subject collateral to, if not identical with, that union, I have had some experience of the sentiments entertained by him, by the gentleman from Virginia, and by another gentleman, from Maryland, who I do not now see in his place, (supposed to be W. C. Johnson,) who fastened upon this House that execrable 21st rule, which is fast driving this Union to its dissolution. I say this without hesitation. A rule which has created more dissension and more ill blood, than all other measures adopted in this House, and which is leading a large portion of the people of this country to approximate towards the opinion that even an open dissolution of the Union would be better than the state of things in which we now live. As to the talents of the gentleman in debate, I, too, have known him on this floor; and, perhaps, the gentleman from Virginia may say of me as he said of my excellent friend from Vermont, that I, also, have great reason to appreciate the gallant valor of his friend from South Carolina. Sir, his friend threatened me with the penitentiary once—[roars of laughter;] that is the greatest exploit of his valor that I am acquainted with. I have met him in this House, and from what I have witnessed here I should give it as my opinion that my friend from Vermont is more than a match for him; and I would say so to his face, if he were here. Whether or not I have felt the power of his lance I leave posterity and the world to say. At the same time, I disclaim all feelings of unkindness toward the gentleman in question. I must say that in the private and individual relations of society, there is not a man in this House with whom I have had a more friendly intercourse during the whole time of his continuance here; even within three days after he had threatened me with the penitentiary. [A laugh.]

But there is one observation which I feel called upon to make at this time, and which I make most unwillingly; and that is, that heretofore, when our present minister to Mexico was a member of this House, and also very recently, within but four days past, it has happened that members from two sections of this Union are not permitted to stand on the same footing, whenever what are called the rights of the South are involved. I refer more particularly to the case of my friend from Vermont, (Mr. Slade,) who rose here and proceeded to speak most perfectly in order, if any such thing as order does exist, but was arrested for touching upon what are called the peculiar institutions of the southern States, and was compelled, by a decision of the Chair, to take his seat.

At witnessing that decision I was greatly afflicted; for I had been so much entertained, and so much instructed too, by the remarks of my friend, that I felt persuaded, had he been permitted to proceed, he would have continued to enlighten us by remarks strictly to the purpose.—Yet within half an hour afterwards, the gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. Wise,) rose, and almost immediately broached the same subject of slavery, and was permitted, without let or interruption, to pursue the whole range of argument he chose to adopt in regard to it. (And for saying this I do not know but I may be arrested and ordered to take my seat, and not to "touch upon the subject of slavery.") I, for one, am not disposed to submit to that inequality any longer. I have witnessed it too long, and in a great variety of forms; but I have always resisted it, and I hope that a sufficient number will here be found resolved to submit to it no longer, but determined to maintain their rights upon this floor; and that, if put down here by force of numbers, they will make their appeal to the justice of the nation.

The second reason in favor of war, put forth by the gentleman from Virginia, I say, is no reason at all. I am willing that our minister should present a modest, sober solicitation to the government of Mexico, for the release of such of our citizens as were taken in the act of marching to invade the Mexican territory under the standard of Texas. But I would not make it a ground of war with Mexico, if her government should reply, "Your citizens thought proper to join themselves with the forces of Texas, and have exposed themselves to even worse treatment than they have received." And, if they did say so, they might refer to the case of two British subjects by the names of Arbuthnot and Ambrister, who once interfered in a certain war between the United States and Seminole Indians, carried on not in our own territory, but on aforeign territory. In that case these men, Arbuthnot and Ambrister, were not brought to this city of Washington, to traverse our streets in chains; they were not exposed to the severity of travelling barefoot for hundreds of miles. No; a course much more summary was observed in their case; they were tried by a court martial, and one of them being a young man, scarcely of age, the court were disposed to let the prisoners off with a punishment comparatively mild, and, the court so found; but what did Andrew Jackson do? He struck his pen across that line in the finding of the court, and they were both hung up. I never complained of that decision of General Jackson, though there were many others who did. I did not, indeed, specifically defend or support the act, in itself considered, but as a national question between us and Spain, and between us and Great Britain, whose subjects they were. The ground I took by the order of my government, not so much to justify the act, as to put off the ground of claim by Great Britain, was, that these individuals had intermeddled in a war they had nothing to do with; in a war not between us and Great Britain, but between us and certain Indian tribes; and that if they chose thus to expose themselves, they must abide the consequences. It was a question of the same character as that on which we are now asked to go to war.

I now come to the third ground urged by the gentleman from Virginia. I understood him to affirm, that if he had the power, he would prohibit the invasion of Texas by Mexico; and if Mexico would not submit to such a requirement, and should persist in her invasion, he would go to war. The gentleman stated, as a ground for war, that Santa Anna had avowed his determination "to drive slavery beyond the Sabine." That was what the gentleman from Virginia most apprehended—that slavery would be abolished in Texas—that we should have neighbors at our door not contaminated by that accursed plague-spot. He would have war with Mexico, sooner than slavery should be driven back to the United States, whence it came! If that is to be the avowed opinion of this committee, in God's name let my constituents know it; let the constituents of all the free States in the Union know it—the sooner it is proclaimed upon the housetops, the better. The House is to go to war with Mexico, for the purpose of annexing Texas to this Union. Yes; and the gentlemen professed, as a triumphant authority, (not indeed in his eyes, for he has not been in the habit of regarding the source of it with much respect, but still as good authority,) a document from a former administration, intended by him to justify the existing executive in proclaiming that he was resolved to do all in his power for the annexation of Texas. Yes, a predecessor of the present incumbent, even *myself*, for want of better authority, was referred to, and alledged to have entertained the same feeling, the same disposition, for the acquisition of this territory.

The gentleman was so good as to send me two letters written by the then Secretary of State, to our minister at the court of Mexico. From those letters the gentleman caused certain extracts to be read, with a view to prove that in 1825, and again in 1827, instructions had been given to propose to the Mexican government a cession of the territory of Texas to the Rio del Norte, and a sum of money was to be offered in consideration. I thank him for citing this paper; it is a correct document. I had myself, in the negotiation of our treaty with Spain, labored to get the Rio del Norte as our boundary; and I adhered to the demand, till Mr. Monroe and all his cabinet directed me to forego it, and to assent to take the Sabine.

And now I repeat what I have said before, that before the treaty was signed, it was carried by me, at the command of Mr. Monroe, to Gen. Jackson; who, after examining it with the map in his hand, approved of the Sabine as the boundary. That fact was contested, with the usual candor of the organ of the administration; and it was declared that a member of the House went to Gen. Jackson, in person, and he recollected nothing of the matter. I then sent for the document, in which the fact was put down in writing at the time, and though it was not published in the papers, it was sent to Mr. Van Buren, for his inspection; and after looking at it, he became satisfied that it was true. Perhaps this is not a material fact; I used it as an answer to the gentleman from Virginia, to show that I did not originally negotiate the treaty with the present boundary of the Sabine. I maintained my demand for the Rio del Norte, till Mr. Monroe and his cabinet overruled me, and assented to the Sabine. But at that time, Texas was a wilderness, with no population, or at least no American population. I do not believe there were 5,000 people in the whole territory, and they were Spanish subjects. In the course of negotiation, and after the terms of the treaty had been concluded, the first American project for the settlement of the country, was brought into being. I received a very long letter from Moses Austin, I think his name was Moses, (father of Stephen Austin,) stating that his object was to make a settlement in the wilderness. He was a sort of a Boon; and he proposed to collect in the midst of New England as large a colony as he could, and with them to go into Texas and settle the country. That was the state of things under which I was in favor of annexation.

When my proposition was made to the Mexican government, in 1825, slavery had been abolished in that territory. There was not a slave there; nor was there the least reason to expect there ever would be. There existed, therefore, no reason why I should be averse to the annexation of this new region to the territory of the Union. Had it been annexed, it would have been settled by freemen. I should certainly have had no objection to that; nor do I know that I should object now, if it were brought within the scope of possibility. I should not indeed desire it, because I think we have quite enough territory already. We have certainly as much as we can manage. But even as territory, it is not desirable. I should not wish it to form a part of the Union, even if it were settled with freemen, and were a free State, as I would have wished it in 1825 or 1827. Slavery was then abolished; and if Texas had come into the Union, there would have been no power in the United States to restore it. Does the gentleman from Virginia think that because, under such circumstances, I wished to see the annexation at that time, that this is an argument either to show the expediency of its annexation now, or any inconsistency in me because I am now utterly opposed to it?

Mr. Wise. I wish to ask the gentleman if he did not instruct our minister to protest against the abolition of slavery in Mexico?

Mr. Adams. (With vehemence.) No, sir! never!

Mr. Wise. Not while the gentleman was President?

Mr. Adams. No, sir! never!

Mr. Wise. It is so charged.

Mr. Adams. As to charges, I hope the gentleman does not expect me to answer them. I never have protested against the abolition of slavery in Mexico, or any where else. I have said that I was not prepared at this time to vote for abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia; and I have offended numbers of my constituents by repeating that declaration; but that is a different thing. But even if I could have protested against the abolition of slavery after it had been instituted, still if my voice could be heard either here or in Texas, or in any other part of the civilized or the savage world, I would have protested, from the bottom of my soul, against its restoration; and that is the insurmountable reason why I never will consent to the annexation of Texas to these United States. I would not take the territory if it were ten thousand times more valuable than it is, sullied as it is with the crime of slavery restored. The people of Texas have not the apology which (with whatever force) is pleaded by many of those in our southern States; that the slavery which now infests them was a vice, a crime, a misfortune, a disease, inflicted upon them by the parent State, and that that is the reason why they must support it now. I must say, that in my heart, if not in my mind, that is the strongest argument they ever have adduced in support of it; but Texas has no such defense to set up; slavery was not bequeathed to them from a selfish and cruel stepmother, as almost all the liberal men of Virginia used to say of it in their commonwealth, not many years ago, and as some among them still say. If there *can* be an apology for this plague-spot, I say again that the people of Texas have none to plead; and that is the reason why Texas never shall, with my consent, or, as I hope, with the consent of my constituents, or of any portion of the free people of the United States, become an integral part of this Union.

There is another reason—a reason I admit vastly inferior to the other, but still it is a reason. Texas has acceded to the right of search; she is bound by treaty to that effect. If you take her as a part of ourselves, you take her with her treaties, and then we shall be bound to cede the right of search to Great Britain. I say that this is a reason of infinitely less importance; yet so like am I to a drowning man who clings even to straws, that I will not consent to the annexation on that account.

Most joyfully would I compound with the gentlemen from the southern portion of the Union, if by our joint efforts we could prevail on Texas to abolish slavery again, of which, indeed, there seems some faint gleam of hope in the published correspondence between Gen. Hamilton, the Texan envoy, and Lord Palmerston. I would compound never to take Texas, or, if they will agree that slavery shall be abolished there, I will agree to take her. But no, never, while breath is in my body, will I consent to the annexation of any foreign State which is burdened with the curse of slavery.

What I am now to say, I say with great reluctance and with great pain. I am well aware that it is touching upon a sore place, and I would gladly get over it if I could. It has been my effort, as far as was in my power, to avoid any allusion whatever to that question which the gentleman from Virginia tells us that the most lamb-like disposition in the South never can approach without anger and indignation. Sir, that is my sorrow. We cannot touch that subject without raising throughout the whole South, a mass of violence and passion, with which one might as well reason as with a hurricane. That I know is the fact in the South, and that is the fact in this House. And it is the reason why members coming from a free State are silenced as soon as they rise on this floor; why they are pronounced out of order; made to sit down; and, if they proceed, are censured and expelled. But, in behalf of the South, and of Southern institutions, a man may get up in this House and expatiate for weeks together. On this point, I do complain; and I must say, I have been rather disappointed that I have not been put down already, as speaking out of order. What I say is involuntary, because the subject has been brought into the House from another quarter, as the gentleman himself admits. I would leave that institution to the exclusive consideration and management of the States more peculiarly interested in it, just as long as they can keep it within their own bounds. So far I admit that Congress has no power to meddle with it. As long as they do not step out of their own bounds, and do not put the question to the people of the United States, whose peace, welfare, and happiness are all at stake, so long will I agree to leave them to themselves. But when a member from a free State brings forward certain resolutions, for which, instead of reasoning to disprove his positions, you vote a censure upon him, and that without hearing, it is quite another affair. At the time this was done, I said that, as far as I could understand the resolutions proposed by the gentleman from Ohio, (Mr. Giddings,) there were some of them for which I was ready to vote, and some which I must vote against; and I will now tell this House, my constituents, and the world of mankind, that the resolution against which I would have voted, was that in which he declares that what are called the slave States have the exclusive right of consultation on the subject of slavery. For that resolution I never would vote; because I believe that it is not just, and does not contain constitutional doctrine. So long as the slave States are able to sustain their institutions without going abroad, or calling upon other parts of the Union to aid them, or act on the subject, so long I will consent never to interfere. I have said this, and I repeat it; but if they come to the free States, and say to them, you must help us to keep down our slaves, you must aid us in an insurrection and a civil war; then I say that with that call comes a full and plenary power to this House and to the Senate over the whole subject. It is a war power. I say it is a war power; and when your country is actually in war, whether it be a war of invasion, or a war of insurrection, Congress has power to carry on the war, and must carry it on according to the laws of war; and by the laws of war an invaded country has all its laws and municipal institutions swept by the board, and martial law takes the place of them.

Let the people of my State be told—a State whose soil tolerates not the foot of a slave—that they are bound by the Constitution to a long and toilsome march under burning summer suns, and a deadly southern clime, for the suppression of a servile war; that they are bound to leave their wives widows, and their children orphans; that those who cannot march are bound to pour out their treasures, while their sons or brothers are pouring out their blood, to suppress a servile, combined with a civil or a foreign war, and yet that there exists no power, beyond the limits of the slave State where such war is raging, to emancipate the slaves! I say, let this be proved—I am open to conviction, but till that conviction comes I put it forth not as a dictate of feeling, but as a settled maxim of the laws of nations, that in such a case the military supersedes the civil power; and on this account I should have been obliged to vote, as I have said, against one of the resolutions of my excellent friend from Ohio, (Mr. Giddings,) or should at least have required that it be amended in conformity with the constitution of the United States.

In the meantime, this is a reason with me for not desiring the annexation of Texas to this Union; because, if we go to war for that annexation, I entertain serious apprehensions that this will become a practical question. If we shall go to war with Mexico, and, which necessarily follows, go to war with Great Britain, to annex Texas to this Union, the day is not remote when, in one of the slave States, an invading army from abroad may be combined with an insurrection of the slaves and with a civil war; and the danger still further heightened by an irruption of that whole body of Indians, whom you have accumulated and compressed together, as if for the very purpose of organizing them for a hostile movement upon our frontier. I put this possibility to the representatives of the southern States, as presenting a most serious and painful consideration to my mind. The gentleman from Virginia makes very light of this. He talks to us about the star of Texas, which he calls the "lone star of liberty." Liberty and Texas! The star of liberty illumined by the radiance of slavery restored! Yes, that is the star which is to lead us on to victory. So, I suppose, if war shall come, we shall not only acquire this solitary brilliant star of Texas, but we shall have all Mexico added to the United States. Sir, the Isthmus of Panama will scarcely stop our victorious arms; and I really wonder the gentleman did not carry us on to Cape Horn. [A laugh.] The gentleman in his dreams, (shall I call them?) told us that President Houston was to plant this same lone star of Texas on the walls of the city of Mexico; and that, if President Houston did not do it, the gentleman himself would. [Loud laughter.) And he means, in this heroic enterprise, to lead on the brave spirits of thousands from the great valley of the Mississippi, inspirited by the hope of robbing churches and priests! So it is to be a religious, as well as a civil expedition—a sort of crusade, in which the gentleman from Virginia is likely far to transcend the exploits of Tamerlane and Ghengis Khan. The gentleman is soon to plant the lone star of Texas and slavery on the walls of Mexico; and then what is to become of the liberties of these United States? [A laugh.] Is it conformable to the history of the world, that the leader of such an army after conquests not reaching to one-tenth the extent of those which the gentleman will achieve, should remain content with the station of an humble private citizen? No. No. The experience of all mankind has given us warning, that if that is to be the course of our public affairs, and such are to be the brilliant fortunes of the gentleman from Virginia, our liberties will stand as little chance in after times, as those of the nine millions of the people of Mexico after he shall have conquered them.

But I am inclined to consider all this rather as approaching to what is sometimes considered rhodomontade, than a thing in the serious contemplation of the gentleman from Virginia; and I look forward to the time when, in the records of history, the gentleman's name shall be placed side by side, not with the names of Ghengis Khan or

Miscellany.

MEMOIR OF BENJAMIN LAY.

[CONCLUDED.]

On one occasion, Benjamin Lay went to Christ Church, Philadelphia. The text was, "He shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on his left." When the service was over, Benjamin went up to the minister, as he passed out, and asked how the sheep would be distinguished from the goats. The clergyman, taking him by the beard, and giving it a gentle shake, replied, "By their beard, Benjamin."

The following anecdotes are recorded in the journal of John Hunt, of New Jersey: Third month, 1785, in conversation with John Forman, of North Wales, I mentioned that I believed Benjamin Lay was the very first among Friends, who bore a testimony against slave-keeping. He said, "No; there was one John Farmer, a Friend, on a visit from England, who at a meeting in Pennsylvania bore a very powerful testimony against slaveholding. A great man who kept negroes, being present, got up and desired Friends *to look on that man as an open enemy to the country.* Other Friends also rather bearing against him, he was persuaded to make something like an acknowledgment. This so troubled John Farmer, that he sunk under it, declined in his gift, and never went back to England. On his death-bed, he said he was easy about everything except flinching from his testimony at that time.

Benjamin Lay had a testimony against tobacco. John Forman said he once saw him come into Yearly meeting, and seat himself between the galleries of the men and women, with three long pipes stuck in his bosom. When the meeting was ready to break up, he rose, and dashed one pipe down among the ministers, on the men's side, another among the women, and a third among the congregation; signifying that they were all alike in this practice.

He likewise had a testimony against tea; and once stood behind the tea-table, preaching all the time the company were drinking. On another occasion, he carried a quantity of tea-cups to the market-place, and broke them publicly. Benjamin Mattack told me his father was present at that transaction. Lay was a very little, light man; and the boys of the town, not willing to see the tea-cups broken, one of them went behind him, stuck his head between his legs, and carried him off on his shoulders, while the other boys bore away the remainder of the crockery.

Persons, who were not acquainted with him, sometimes deceived themselves by supposing him to be destitute of common understanding. In company he would often make observations and remarks, calculated to provoke argument, with a view to fathom the minds of those with whom he conversed; and the estimate of their characters was formed with astonishing facility and correctness. His replies were always pointed, and strictly adapted to the nature of the questions proposed; for he instantly discovered whether an inquiry was made with a desire to obtain information, or suggested to gratify mere curiosity, and produce ridicule. He was also scrupulously careful to respect the truth, in all his conversation; and would rebuke those who in the least degree departed from it, by the use of words and phrases, complimentary or otherwise, which did not proceed from the heart. As he was once walking from his home to Philadelphia, he was met by several persons on horseback, who unwisely expected he would afford them diversion. One of the party stopped him, with this salutation—"*Sir, your humble servant.*" Lay looked upon the stranger, and said, "*If thou art my humble servant, clean my shoes.*" Not sufficiently ascertained of his character by that remark, they jestingly inquired of him which was the direct route to heaven? Lay promptly replied—"*Do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with your God.*" They were then satisfied without further interrogation; and left him, evidently mortified at their impotent efforts to produce idle merriment, by insult upon real virtue.

He always travelled on foot, and made frequent visits in the neighborhood, as well as at a considerable distance from home. Having once walked to Philadelphia, with an intention of conversing with an individual of considerable note, he found the family, on his arrival, sitting at breakfast; Lay entered the room, and was invited to partake with them; but seeing a black servant in attendance, he inquired of his master, "*Is this man a slave?*" being answered affirmatively, he said, "*Then I will not share with thee the fruits of thy unrighteousness;* and immediately departed from the house. He never owned a slave himself, neither would he sit with, nor partake of the food of any one who did. Notwithstanding the popular antipathy against Lay, he enjoyed the friendship and society of some of the most pious and learned men, who at that time adorned the province of Pennsylvania. The most cordial attachment subsisted between him and the truly honorable Anthony Benezet. He maintained through life, an uninterrupted intercourse with Dr. Franklin, Dr. De Benneville, and many other distinguished characters. He was also intimately acquainted with Ralph Sandiford, who, like himself, was an ardent opposer of slavery, and wrote upon the subject.

Benjamin Lay's mind was not exclusively directed to the subject of the trade in human flesh, and the shocking train of evils by which it was attended; it observed, and investigated, other objects connected with the interests of civil society and the welfare of man. His attention was directed to a consideration of the nature and propriety of the then existing punishments, for offenses against the criminal laws. The ideas which, within thirty years, have so extensively prevailed on this subject, and which have led to the melioration of the penal code of Pennsylvania, (a code now admired and imitated,) were suggested by Lay, as long since as the year 1737,—at that time he thus notices the subject: "As to criminals, they had better be kept in bondage, that by hard labor they might be brought to repentance and amendment of life, in order to a happy death, rather than to put them to death in their sins; for in the grave there is no repentance. Hard labor and mean living is an antidote to luxury and idleness; and captivity, the reverse of nature, might prevent a great deal of wickedness in the world, and bring many unthinking creatures to remember and prepare for their latter end, before it is too late; which I should rejoice to see." This judicious, enlightened, and truly Christian sentiment, is of itself an imperishable evidence of the profound conceptions of his understanding, and alone sufficient, if there were no other proof of his desire to promote the happiness of his fellow-creatures, to entitle him to the respect and gratitude of mankind.

With the same enlightened zeal, he pointed out the pernicious consequences which would result from the introduction of foreign spirits into this country. He declared that the general use of them would corrupt and degrade any people; and that there was danger, if they could be easily and cheaply procured, of their becoming the habitual beverage of the inhabitants. He introduces the subject, in considering the trade which at that day was extensively carried on with the West Indies; and says, "We send away our excellent provisions, and other good things, to purchase such filthy stuff, which tends to the corruption of mankind; and they send us some of their worst slaves, when they cannot rule them themselves, along with their *rum*, to complete the tragedy; that is to say, to destroy the people in Pennsylvania, and ruin the country."

In fulfilling the purposes of his universal philanthropy, he devoted a portion of his time to visiting schools, and embraced every proper opportunity of impressing the susceptible minds of children with a just and reverent sense of their duties toward God; enforcing the importance of early establishing themselves in habits of order, sobriety, and frugality; inculcating the principles of humanity by simple illustrations, and recommending it to them to be governed through life by the precepts, and to follow the meek and humble example of our holy Redeemer. The following feeling observation is from the pen of an ancient and worthy gentleman, who in his early youth was a member of one of the schools that Lay frequented: "When the children were reading the Bible, he would stop them, and explain particular passages for their improvement; and although we at that time thought too lightly of Benjamin's anxiety for our welfare, yet some of his labors and admonitions are remembered (by one at least of the scholars,) at the present day; though his advice was imparted more than sixty years ago."

Lay had no compassion for vagrant mendicants; he used frequently to assert, that "any one who is able to go abroad and beg, can earn four-pence a day; and that is enough to keep a person above want or dependence in this country." He was nevertheless charitable towards those who, by disease, or misfortune, were reduced to necessitous circumstances; and among the numerous instances of his judicious dispensation of money, the following is worthy of notice. He understood that a poor woman in the neighborhood, was in need of relief, and to ascertain the fact, called upon a respectable person, whom he supposed to be acquainted with the particulars of her situation. Having thus satisfied himself of the case, he presented to the person on whom he had called, several silver pieces—saying, "*Lay this out for her, but don't let it be known where it came from.*"

His fondness for frequent retirement and meditation, continued throughout his life; and for the more complete indulgence and enjoyment of this rational habit, he selected an interesting spot, on the farm of the person with whom he resided, and improved a natural excavation in the earth, near a fine spring of water, so as to afford himself a commodious apartment. The interior part of the roof of his cave was neatly ornamented with festoons of evergreen; and in other respects, the room was conveniently fitted for his purpose. Here was kept his library of books, which amounted to nearly two hundred volumes, comprising some of the works of the best authors in theology, biography, poetry, and history. In that seclusion he reflected, read, and wrote.

After Lay's death, the principal part of his manuscripts were preserved by the gentleman with whom he lived; but it is sincerely to be lamented that those relics fell into the hands of the British, during the revolutionary war; who, it is supposed, destroyed them. His books were disposed of at the sale of his effects. Two of these volumes have, after considerable search, been lately discovered. They contain numerous marginal annotations, indicating the character of this Christian philosopher.

His precepts were generally sound, and uniformly supported by the weighty sanction of practice.—Whatever he conceived to be his duty, that he performed, at every hazard. He persuaded, admonished, and threatened, without fear or flattery.

One of the most extraordinary acts of his life, was the attempt he made, in imitation of the Saviour of mankind, to fast for the term of forty days. Perhaps no Christian professor, except himself, ever conceived the fast of our Saviour to be intended as an example for mankind. We must not, however, rashly condemn the conduct of Lay. He certainly acted from a sense of duty; and the voluntary penance to which he subjected himself, is at least a proof of resolute self-denial, and of the power of the human system to sustain itself under a deprivation of its accustomed subsistence. He persisted in his fast for three weeks. For several days after he had commenced it, he continued to pursue his common occupations. He rose at his usual time, which was always at the dawn of day, took his usual exercise, and made his usual excursions in the neighborhood. One morning he even walked to Philadelphia, to have an interview with Dr. Franklin; who has often been heard to remark that, on that occasion, Lay's breath was so acrid, as to produce a suffusion of water in his eyes, which was extremely painful. The following memorandum will show what were Lay's feelings at the time it was made: "*25th of 12th mo.* 1737–8, *this being the ninth day of my fasting; having taken nothing but spring water several times a day, and am as well in health, as ever, since I came to Pennsylvania.*" Soon after this, his strength began to yield. He was at length unable to leave his chamber; and finally, was confined to his bed. When he could no longer help himself, he directed a large loaf of bread to be placed on a table near him, and upon this he kept his eyes steadily fixed. He conversed very little; but he often addressed himself in these words: "*Benjamin, thou seest it, but thou shalt not eat it.*"

Vain were the solicitations of his friends to induce him to abandon his purpose; his mind was immovable, notwithstanding all their representations, that if he persisted much longer, he would certainly perish. With the rapid sinking of his system, his mental faculties began to fail. As soon as this was perceived by those around him, they administered suitable diet, and thus he was gradually restored.

During the last two years of his life, the infirmities of age disqualified him for much exertion, either of body or mind. He remained principally at home, employed in spinning, and other domestic operations. Honey was one of the few articles of his food; and he amused himself with constructing hives for the accommodation of his bees, and observing their curious labor. By his friendly care to those industrious insects, and by abstaining from the cruel practice of destroying them, in order to procure their honey, he increased his original family to a large community, whose dwellings extended more than a hundred feet, in a continued line.

To a person who went to see him in the last year of his life, he offered to secure one hundred pounds, if he would engage, after his death, to burn his body, and throw the ashes into the sea. He assigned no reason for the wish which dictated this singular proposition; and the individual to whom the application was made, declining the office, he never after mentioned it. Whether he was led to make this request from his admiration of the character of Lycurgus, who had expressed a similar desire as to the disposal of his body after death, is not known; though the idea probably originated in that source.

Not long before his death, a friend of Lay's made him a visit for the purpose of acquainting him that the religious Society of Friends had come to the determination to disown such of their members as could not be persuaded to desist from the practice of holding slaves, or were concerned in the importation of them. The venerable friend and advocate of that oppressed race of men, attentively listened to this heart-cheering intelligence; and after a few moments' reflection on what he had heard, he rose from his chair, and in an attitude of devotional reverence, poured forth this pious ejaculation:—"*Thanksgiving and praise be rendered unto the Lord God.*" After a short pause, he added—"*I can now die in peace.*"

Thus were his feelings sublimed by the solemn conviction of the controlling influence of the Deity. To Him he considered the acknowledgment due, for this change in the conduct of Friends; and to Him was it fervently offered. At this interesting period, Lay's mind also appears to have conceived the prophetic and joyful anticipation, that as he had lived to witness an event which he so ardently desired, and so faithfully labored to promote, he would now be permitted to close in tranquillity his career on earth. This expectation was soon realized; for a short time after, being absent from home, he was suddenly taken ill. In consequence of this event, several of his neighbors met, for the purpose of devising what could best be done for him in his actual situation. Among these, was his friend Joshua Morris; whom Lay observing, several times requested that he might be taken to his house. He was at length conveyed thither. The continued violence of his disease convinced those around him that it would terminate his life; and Lay himself was fully sensible of his danger. He therefore directed his attention to some necessary arrangements with regard to his worldly affairs; and, by a verbal will, gave to the Society of Friends at Abington, the sum of forty pounds, to be appropriated to the education of the poor children of that meeting. About two weeks after his attack, he peacefully surrendered his life to Him who gave it; on the 3d of the 2d month, (February,) 1759, aged 82. During 41 years, 28 of which were passed in Pennsylvania, he had continued his zealous testimony against African slavery.

His remains were interred in Friend's burial ground at Abington; and the inventory of his effects, taken after his decease, exhibited his estate to be worth five hundred and eighteen pounds, twelve shillings and nine pence; all of which was personal property.

The most delicate and difficult part of the office, voluntarily undertaken by his biographer, is to form an impartial and generous estimate of the character of Benjamin Lay.

He was certainly a man eminently endowed with strong natural abilities; but his intellectual powers were not expanded by an education founded upon the basis of sound and liberal learning, nor was his mind polished and refined by the embellishments of ornamental literature. His knowledge of mankind was extensive, but to the polite accomplishments of the world, he paid little regard. It is not therefore surprising, that in the support of his favorite opinions, he was obstinate to excess; and toward those who opposed him, ungracious to a proverb. His temper was violent, but it was always excited for mercy's sake, and in behalf of those who dared not assert their own rights. His eccentricity was remarkable; but, in the main, it subserved the purposes of utility. His habits, though singular, were in many respects worthy of imitation. Some will alledge, and none can doubt, that he occasionally manifested symptoms of derangement; yet all must acknowledge that "*oppression will make a wise man mad.*" That he was pious and benevolent, most will admit. That he was disinterested and generous, none can deny. That his opinions were correct concerning the great work of reformation, of which he was one of the founders, we have the almost universal consent of mankind, in the honorable verdict which civilized nations have pronounced upon the question.

The celebrated Dr. Rush, speaking of Benjamin Lay, says: "There was a time, when the name of this celebrated Christian philosopher was familiar to every man, woman, and to nearly every child, in Pennsylvania. His size was little above four feet; his dress, which was always the same, consisting of light colored, plain clothes, a white hat, and half-boots; his milk-white beard, which hung upon his breast; and, above all, his peculiar principles and conduct, rendered him to many, an object of admiration; and to all, a subject of conversation."

WHAT GOOD WILL IT DO?

"What good will it do, if I do join the cold water army?" said Henry, when he found every objection he could make, was easily answered.

"What good will it do?" replied uncle Edward, "sit down on the bank, here, and I will tell you a story."

Henry threw his skates down beside his uncle, and listened while he related the following, about

BLACK-EYED JOE.

Two or three years ago, I went into a town in the State of New-Hampshire, to give a temperance lecture. There were many persons in the village who did not drink intoxicating liquors. But many came to hear me; and I noticed, just as I commenced speaking, a little bright-eyed boy, just about your age, who came into the hall and sat down near the door. He listened very attentively, and when I spoke of the cruel treatment of wives and children from intemperate men, I saw him more than once take his handkerchief and wipe away the tears. I told them the pledge would prevent all this, and make them kind and pleasant; and I told the children to sign it, if they would prosper and be happy in the world. This little fellow was almost the first to put his name down; and when I asked the people who he was, they told me he was called *Black-eyed Joe;* and that his father was one of the worst drunkards in town.

It was his custom every morning, to mingle rum and sugar with water, and pass it round to every one of the children, who took a little, as well as their father and mother.

He would drink again at eleven o'clock, and at noon-time, at four o'clock, and at supper. So that when evening came, he would always be intoxicated, cruel, and revengeful. Sometimes he would beat his children, or shut them out of doors in the cold storms. It was this that made Joseph weep, when I told of cruelty to children; and it was this that induced him to sign the pledge.

He went home from the meeting, and determined to keep his resolution. The next morning, as usual, his father took out the brown jug, filled the pitcher of poison, and handed it to Joseph first.

"Drink, Joe!" said his father.

"I do not wish for any again, sir," replied Joseph.

His father looked at him sternly a moment, and then said, roughly,

"Did you go to that temperance meeting, Joe?"

"Yes, sir," he replied.

"Did you sign the pledge?"

"Yes, sir."

"What did you do that for, Joe?"

"Because, father," said Joseph, hesitatingly, "if I am ever a man, I do not want to be as you are."

His father blushed, turned pale, stood confused a moment, and then opened the door and dashed the jug and pitcher to pieces; saying,

"You shall have a father, Joe, that you won't be ashamed to be like!"

From that hour he has never taken anything that can intoxicate; and is happy himself, and renders his family happy beside; and I will venture to say, that Joseph will have an answer ready for any one who asks him, "what good will it do," to sign the pledge?

"Uncle Edward, you may put my name down," said Henry, "and I thank you for telling me that story." So saying, he put on his skates, went off upon the ice with a swift motion, to tell the story of Black-eyed Joe to his companions.—*Cold Water Army.*

YANKEE BOARDING.

"What do you charge for board?" asked a tall, Green-Mountain boy, as he walked up to the bar of a second-rate hotel, in New York. "What do you ask a week for board and lodging?" "Five dollars!" "That's too much: but I suppose you'll allow for the times I am absent, dinner and supper?" "Certainly—thirty-seven and a half cents each." Here the conversation ended, and the Yankee took up his quarters for two weeks. During this time, he lodged and breakfasted at the hotel, but did not take either dinner or supper, saying his business detained him in another portion of the town. At the expiration of the two weeks, he again walked up to the bar, and said, "S'pose we settle that account,—I am going in a few minutes." The landlord handed him his bill—"Two weeks board, per $5,——$10." "Here, stranger," said the Yankee, "this bill is wrong—you've made a mistake; you've not deducted the times I was absent from dinner and supper—14 days, 2 meals per day—28 meals, 37 1-2 cents each—$10 50. If you've not got the fifty cents change that's due me, *I'll take the balance in segars.*"

WISE WORDS FROM JOHN WESLEY.

We may die without the knowledge of many truths, and be carried to Abraham's bosom; but if we die without love, what will knowledge avail us? Just as much as it avails the devil and his angels. I will not quarrel with you about any opinion; only see that your hearts be right towards God—that you love the Lord Jesus Christ—that you love your neighbor—walk as your master walked, and I desire no more. I am sick of *opinions;* I am weary to hear them—my soul loathes their frothy food.—Give me solid, substantial religion—give me a humble lover of God and man—a man full of mercy and good fruits,—a man laying himself out in the work of faith, the patience of hope, the labor of love. Let my soul be with such Christians, wheresoever they are; and whatsoever opinions they may hold.

"He that doeth the will of my Father in heaven, the same is my brother, and my sister, and my mother."

SCRAPS.

WOMAN.—The woman instructed only in a round of frivolous accomplishments can never be the proper companion of an intellectual and cultivated man. There is no sex in mind; and the education of woman should be as thorough, as practical, and as substantial as that of men. So only can woman be elevated to her proper dignity and restored to her lost rights. So only may she become what her Creator designed her to be, the equal and associate of man; and vie with him in the full development of her intellectual nature, and in preparation for her immortal destiny.—*H. W. Bellows' Lecture.*

HYPOCRISY.—It is the greatest madness in the world to be a hypocrite in religious profession. Men hate thee because thou art a Christain *even* in appearance; and God approves thee not because thou art, *only* in appearance: and so thou hast no comfort in either. If thou wilt not *be* good as thou seemest, better *seem* ill, as thou art.

SPEAK THE TRUE WORD, LIVE THE TRUE LIFE.—One watch set right will do to try many by; and on the other hand, one that goes wrong may be the means of misleading a whole neighborhood.

RELIGIOUS CHEERFULNESS.—"The poet Carpani once asked his friend Hayden 'how it happened that his church music was always of an animating, cheerful, and even gay description.' To this Hayden's answer was, 'I cannot make it otherwise; I write according to the thoughts which I feel; when I think upon God, my heart is so full of joy, that the notes dance and leap as it were from my pen; and since God has given me a cheerful heart, it will be easily forgiven me that I serve him with a cheerful spirit.'"

THE WHOLE OF LIFE BRIEFLY UTTERED.—Whole volumes are contained in the concise but glorious biography of Barnabas. "He was a good man, full of the Holy Ghost and of faith, and much people was added unto the Lord."

FOR HOUSEKEEPERS AND FARMERS.

CURE FOR A RATTLESNAKE'S BITE.

I have been told by a skillful physician that the following precautions would certainly prevent the bad effects from the bite of a rattlesnake; and his own opinion was that it might prove effectual likewise in case of a bite by a mad dog.

Put three or four tea-spoonsful of water of ammonia (sometimes called hartshorn) into a wine-glass of water. Wash the wound with this *immediately,* and thoroughly. Throw the dregs and the rag into the fire, or somewhere entirely out of the way of doing injury to anybody. Take a fresh rag, and a fresh preparation of ammonia, and again wash the wound thoroughly. Continue to repeat the application through the day, and at night lay on the wound a doubled linen rag, well wet with water of ammonia, diluted with common water, as above.

In addition to this, drink *as quick as possible after the bite,* a tea-spoonful of water of ammonia stirred into a common wine-glass of water; and renew this every fifteen minutes for an hour. Occasional doses for several days might be useful.

Ammonia in excessive doses is poisonous; but its effects may be counteracted by lemon-juice, vinegar, or other *vegetable* acids.

It is said that the poison of a rattlesnake is not dangerous if taken into the *stomach,* instead of being infused into the blood. In Georgia, hogs eat rattlesnakes without injury; and if bitten by them, they are not harmed, because their mass of fat prevents the poison from reaching the blood. It is said that a person may *suck* a wound made by a rattlesnake, though it might be dangerous to touch it with a cut finger. Eleanor, the famous wife of Edward I., sucked her husband's wound, when he had been shot in battle with an arrow dipped in the venom of snakes. Such arrows caused certain death. The devoted queen saved her husband's life, as she and others supposed, at the risk of her own; but no ill effects appeared; probably for the reason above mentioned.

Several of the noblest relics of antiquity in England are monuments erected by Edward to the memory of this beloved consort. Among these is *Charing* Cross; a corruption of *Chere Reine,* or the dear queen.—L. M. C.

Making Butter.—The following process is much in use among the Russians, and the Scotch. The recommendations of it are the sweetness of the cream; (the milk not standing more than twelve or fourteen hours,) the ease with which the butter is brought, the churning seldom requiring more than a few minutes; and the improved quality of the skimmed milk, which, by being heated, is made thicker and richer.

They put the milk into copper or brass pans, very thoroughly tinned. About twenty minutes, or half an hour, after it is strained, the pans are placed on stoves, heated by charcoal. In a few minutes the heat causes the cream to rise in a thick consistence, called clotted cream. When it is sufficiently warmed, the pans are returned to the dairy; and as soon as the milk is cold, the clotted cream is taken off into a large, earthern bowl, and a slight movement with the hands, or a wooden spatula, almost immediately converts it into butter. Very little buttermilk is pressed from cream thus prepared, and what is, is remarkably rich.

Cheese made from Potatoes.—Cheese, it is said, of fine quality, is manufactured from potatoes in Thuringia and a part of Saxony, in the following manner:—After having collected a quantity of potatoes of good quality, giving the preference to the large, white kind, they are boiled in a caldron, and, becoming cool, they are peeled and reduced to a pulp, either by means of a grate or mortar. To 5 lbs. of this pulp, which ought to be as equal as possible, is added 1 lb. of sour milk, and the necessary quantity of salt. The whole is kneaded together, and the mixture covered up and allowed to remain for two or three days, according to the season.—At the end of this time it is kneaded again, and the cheese placed in little baskets, where the superfluous moisture is allowed to escape. They are then allowed to dry in the shade, and placed in layers, in large pots or vessels, where they must remain for 15 days. The older these cheeses are, the more the quality improves. Two kinds of them are made. The first which is the most common, is made according to the proportions above indicated; the second, with four parts of potatoes and four parts of ewe or cow milk. The cheeses have this advantage over every other kind, that they do not engender worms, and keep fresh a great number of years; provided they are placed in a dry situation, and in well closed vessels. *Doncaster Chronicle.*

To Raise Good Radishes.—Take pure sand, some depth from the surface; or pure earth, below where it has been tilled or moved; or sea sand, washed by the waves; make a bed in the garden, six or eight inches deep, and as big as you please; in this sow your radish seed, and they will grow well without manure, and be free from worms; we have tried it frequently, and never failed.

Radishes that are grown very early in the season are of slow growth, and inferior to those grown after the weather is warm enough to hasten them; as the faster they grow, the more tender, and the finer flavor.—*Yankee Farmer.*

Important Facts with regard to the Milk Sickness.—A highly intelligent gentleman, formerly of this city, says the Louisville Journal, and now a resident of Illinois, who has spent much time in the portions of the State which are subject to the milk sickness, has communicated to us one or two important facts respecting that remarkable and formidable disease, which were new to us, and may be to most of our readers. He states that an acquaintance of his, who has lived in the milk sickness region for many years, early adopted the practice of salting his cattle regularly every day; and observed that while his neighbor's cattle were affected with the disease, his own invariably escaped. This course he pursued for several years, with the same result; but at length becoming careless and neglecting to salt his cattle regularly, some of them were seized with the sickness. He immediately returned to his former promptness in giving them regularly every morning as much salt as they would eat, and since that time he has not been troubled with the milk sickness among his stock. Hence he concludes that salting cattle regularly every day is an effectual protection against that disease. It is well known that the flesh of cattle affected with the milk sickness will prove fatal when eaten fresh—The gentleman first referred to, states, that the salted beef made from the same animals may be, and is, eaten with impunity.

Miscellaneous Items.

Return.—Our countryman, Mr. Edwards, who was seized by the Chinese, and very ill treated on suspicion of being an Englishman, has arrived here safely.

Progress of Humanity in the "Church of Christ!"—The Rev. G. B. Cheever has been diligently preaching, to prove the authority and expediency of Punishment by Death; and his work is now published. It contains a chapter by the Rev. Samuel Cox, proposing to *reform* the criminal code by decapitation instead of hanging.

Indian Treaty.—An important council was held on the 9th instant, in the western part of New-York, at the suggestion of those universal peace-makers, the Friends, and was attended by chiefs from all the tribes. A proposition has been submitted to the Indians to annul the said treaty, and make a new one, by which the Indians on the Tonawanda and Buffalo Creek Reservations shall give up these lands, and all be concentrated on the Cattaraugus Reservation; which, as it consists of some 50,000 acres, is sufficiently large for them all. It is said that the Indians regard the offer with great favor. If they accept it, there is little doubt that it will be approved by the government, and that thus this unhappy difficulty will be amicably arranged.—*New-York Tribune.*

Fatal case of Hydrophobia.—G. S. Johnson lately died of this disease, at Lafayette, La. In the early part of last December, his dog, which was confined in the yard, becoming very noisy in the night, Mr. J. got up and chastised him; the dog snapped at his hand, inflicting a slight wound in the heel of the thumb. Two of Mr. Johnson's children, who had run out to see what was going on, were also bitten, and the dog was killed on the spot. Nothing more was thought of the matter until the 4th of the present month; when Mr. Johnson, upon approaching the water bucket, from which he was in the habit of drinking, became suddenly sick and giddy, and nearly fainted. The truth flashed upon him in an instant; and, telling his wife that the dog he had killed was mad, he requested to be confined, and Dr. Stone was immediately sent for. The wretched man was fastened down upon his bed, and lived in the most excruciating agony, with occasional moments of sanity, until Friday night; when he expired in the most dreadful torture. The two children who were bitten have as yet manifested no symptoms of the disease.—*New-Orleans Picayune.*

Remarkable instance of Suicide.—We learn from the letter of a friend, that Captain James Pettit, residing near McNairs, in Polk county, (Tenn.) committed suicide on the 16th of February, by blowing out his brains with a rifle. He placed the muzzle of the gun directly between his eyes, and discharged it by a string, attached in some way to the trigger. He had no white family, nor was there any person on the premises, except his negroes—27 in number. A jury of inquest was summoned, and the manner in which the deceased came to his death settled; after which a portion of the jury took charge of his effects. They got his keys, and upon opening the first trunk, found his will, written six days previous, by which two of the jury, then present, were appointed his executors; (one of which is the friend who communicates this intelligence.) They also found, in the same trunk, ten thousand dollars in gold and silver. The purport of the will was, that his negroes should be freed, and all his effects, together with the cash on hand, divided amongst them. The money was deposited in one of the banks at Athens, for safe keeping, and the executors took charge of his other property.—*Highland (S. C.) Sentinel.*

Temperance.—Hon. S. M. Gates writes that it is no longer singular, even at the President's table, to see many guests decline wine, and pledge his Excellency in a glass of clear, cold water, not even colored with toast, to save appearance.

Another Pensioner Gone.—In Boston, on the 22d ultimo, Primus Hall, a respectable colored citizen, and revolutionary pensioner, of the United States, aged 84. Mr. Hall was well known, particularly to the younger portion of our citizens, to whom he was in the habit of recounting scenes of the revolutionary war, especially the capture of General Burgoyne, and the surrender of Lord Cornwallis, at both of which he was present. He was attached to the Quartermaster General's Department, and for about two years was in the military family of General Washington, of whom he spoke with that fervor of attachment which was common to all who were personally acquainted with that great man. He has departed full of years, to meet, we trust, the reward of a good and faithful servant.—*Boston Transcript.*

Singular Coincidence.—Some fourteen years since, Captain D. Wilson, of Wrentham, Mass. was struck upon the right eye by a hoop-pole, accidentally thrown by a deaf and dumb brother. He lost his eye. A few weeks since a hoop-pole was thrown by his son, which accidentally struck his left eye. He is therefore now blind.

Quite a Family.—A hollow tree was lately felled in Bucks county, Pa. which measured seven feet in diameter, and contained, as inhabitants, a swarm of bees, three grey squirrels, two large hooting owls, a nest of flying squirrels, and a large number of mice.

A Noble Act.—A short time since, an occurrence took place at the Navy Yard at Charlestown, Mass. which deserves to be recorded. A lady had entered the ropewalk, and was examining with much interest the process of making rope, and whilst earnestly gazing at the strands, as by the operation of machinery they were rapidly twisted, she unconsciously approached so near, that one end of the scarf which she wore on her neck, was caught in some of the strands, composed of some fifteen or twenty yarns, and she was drawn with irresistible force towards the strand, and would have been inevitably strangled in half a minute, had it not been for the presence of mind, courage, and muscular strength of Francis F. Joy, one of the mechanics employed in the establishment, who fortunately happened to be near at the time.

There was not time to ring the bell, as a signal to stop the machinery—and as the *only* means to save the life of the woman, he sprang and grasped in his hands the strand, at a distance of about a foot from the scarf, and between the woman and the propelling machinery, and compressing it so forcibly as to prevent any twist below the part which he thus seized. Although suffering much pain from the twisting of the rope, he held on nobly, until the strand absolutely *twisted off within an inch of his hands, and the woman saved without injury!* Not so, however, with Mr. Joy. His hands were much blistered and swollen, for several days.—*Boston Mercantile Journal.*

Dead Letters.—Upwards of 300,000 letters are quarterly returned to the General Post-office at Washington, from the different Post-offices in the Union, as dead.

Government vs. *Conscience.*—The legislature of Iowa has refused to exempt the Quakers from the performance of military duty.

CHESTERFIELD BOARDING SCHOOL,

For Boys under fourteen years of Age,

Situated on the Crosswicks road, about three miles from Bordentown, N. J.

THE School will open for the summer term, on the 16th day of the 5th month, 1842. In the government of the school, care will be extended to form such habits and inculcate such principles, as will best advance the welfare of the pupils, both morally and physically. The scholars will be expected to attend (with their teacher) Friends' meeting, at Crosswicks, about three-fourths of a mile distant. The number of boys limited to twenty.

TERMS: Sixty dollars per term of twenty-two weeks; payable half in advance, the remainder in the middle of the term—books and stationery included; no extra charges. The services of an assistant in the school has been engaged. It is desirable that the outer garments of the boys should be dark colored, and all the clothing marked with the pupil's name. HENRY W. RIDGWAY.

References.—Joseph Ridgway, No. 70, Chesnut street; George Truman, No. 105, Arch street; George M. Justice, No. 149, Market street; Philadelphia. Charles Marriott, I. T. Hopper, J. S. Gibbons, New-York.

4th-mo. 21.

FREE-LABOR GOODS,

At Wholesale and Retail.

CALICOES, small and large figures; 4-4, 5-4, and 6-4 unbleached Muslins; do. do. do. bleached Muslins; super Manchester Ginghams; 3-4 and 4-4 colored Muslins; 7-8 and 4-4 Bed Tickings; Canton Flannel, bleached and unbleached; Cotton Laps and Wadding, low price; bleached and unbleached and colored Knitting Cotton; Cotton Yarn; Manchester Stripe, for men's wear; Apron Checks and Furniture Checks. Also, a full assortment of Cloths, Cassimeres, Linen Sheetings and Shirtings, Grass Cloth Hdkfs., Mouslin de Laines, and Silks.

Persons from a distance, (store-keepers in particular,) wishing any of the above goods can have them sent, by forwarding their orders, and at the lowest prices at which they can be afforded.

N. B.—The above cotton goods are all warranted to be *free from Slave Labor.* Persons wishing to purchase can have full evidence of the fact.

CHARLES WISE,

N. W. corner of Arch and Fifth streets.

Philadelphia, 1st mo., 13th, 1842.

FREE LABOR DRY GOODS.

Manufactured by American Free Produce Associations.

4-4 Stout muslin bleached and unbleached; furniture checks, 4 qualities and prices; apron checks, do. do. 7-4 and 8-4 table diaper, (huckaback,) bleached and unbleached; 7-4 and 8-4 table diaper, (bird's-eye,) bleached and unbleached; bird's-eye cotton towelling; bed ticking, pantaloons stuffs, yellow striped; Manchester ginghams, various patterns and two qualities; canton flannel, bleached and unbleached; wadding, black and white; cotton laps, &c. for sale retail by LYDIA WHITE, No. 241, North Second street, and wholesale by D. L. MILLER, Jr. 250 Arch street, or W. C. BETTS, 43 Cherry street.

In addition to the above, the association is now having made colored cambrics, men's half hose, women's stockings, cotton fringe, cord, calicoes, pantaloon stuffs, fancy patterns. LYDIA WHITE,

D. L. MILLER, Jr.

Philadelphia, 3d mo. 31, 1842. W. C. BETTS.

Paper Hangings and Borders,

WHOLESALE AND RETAIL,

N. E. corner of Arch and Seventh-streets, Philadelphia.

THE subscriber informs his friends and the public, that he keeps constantly on hand, plain and fancy Paper Hangings, suitable for vestibules, entries, parlors, dining rooms and chambers, of the most approved patterns and colors, and from the best manufactories; also, single and double Curtain Paper, and an extensive assortment of Fire Screens.

Country merchants supplied on reasonable terms.

Paper put up at short notice, and warranted.

WILLIAM W. CANSLER.

April 14th, 1842.

Removal.

VAN RENSSELAER'S TEMPERANCE EATING HOUSE, No. 122 Water-street, opposite George W. Browne's Auction Hotel.

The proprietor of this old establishment has removed to 122 Water-street, a few doors above Wall, near his former location.

His refreshments are of the *first quality,* and are served up with neatness and increased despatch. His *prices* are in accordance with the times.

New-York, April 14th, 1842.

Graham House.

TO TRAVELERS.—Gentlemen visiting this city are respectfully invited to stop at the Graham House, 68 Barclay street, where a quiet home, pleasant rooms, clean beds, wholesome food, and an atmosphere unpoisoned by alcohol or tobacco, await their acceptance. Those who believe it impossible to live on a rigidly temperate and purely vegetable diet, without severe privation, are requested to give it a trial. The house is very convenient to the business part of the city, and to all the steamboat landings. Terms moderate. Gentlemen visiting the city with a part of their families will find such a home vastly more agreeable than a hotel. Shower-baths free.

Jonathan Jefferson Whitlaw.

One hundred copies of Mrs. Trollope's "Jonathan Jefferson Whitlaw," have been imported from Europe, and are for sale at the *Anti-Slavery Office,* No. 31, North Fifth street, Philadelphia; and at 143 Nassau st., N. Y.

This book has a very high reputation, where no pro-slavery prejudices come in to obscure the judgment. It is a work of remarkable truth and power. The following, from the Leeds Mercury, is one of the many commendatory notices, which hailed its first appearance.

"This book is exceedingly clever, and surpasses anything the author has hitherto published. Her dialogues are full of spirit, and bear the genuine impress of the peculiarities of vulgar American dialect. In fact, in many parts of J. J. Whitlaw, she fairly emulates the masculine power of the best novel-writers in our language."

Philadelphia, March 3d, 1842.

PHILADELPHIA ANTI-SLAVERY OFFICE,

No. 31, North Fifth street.

The National Anti-Slavery Standard, will be issued regularly from this office, on Thursday of every week.

TERMS—the same as in New-York; i. e. $2,00 a year if paid in advance; $2,50 if not paid within six months.

$10,00 in advance will pay for six copies for one year, sent to one address; and $30,00 will pay for twenty copies.

A full assortment of anti-slavery publications is kept constantly on hand. Also, a handsome variety of miscellaneous books, and useful and fancy stationery.

All letters relating to the business of the office, should be directed to *J. Miller McKim,* No. 31, North Fifth st.

LOCAL AGENTS FOR THE STANDARD.

EDWARD M. DAVIS, Philadelphia, Penn.
J. MILLER M'KIM, " "
WM. APLIN, Providence, R. I.
LORRIN WHITING, New Marlborough, Mass.
LUTHER MYRICK, Cazenovia, N. Y.
W. C. BLOSS, Rochester, N. Y.
JAMES COOPER, Williamson, Wayne Co., N. Y.
PLINY SEXTON, Palmyra, " "
J. C. HATHAWAY, Farmington, Ontario Co., N. Y.
WM. T. CRITTENDEN, Rushville, " "
WM. P. POWELL, No. 61 Cherry st., New-York City.
THOMAS MCCLINTOCK, Waterloo, N. Y.
MORRIS EARLE, Penn Yan, Yates Co.,